THE PROBLEM OF EQUIVALENCE

The Egyptian Society of Comparative Literature (ESCL)

THE PROBLEM OF EQUIVALENCE

Non-Linguistic Phenomena
In
Arabic-German Translation

By Soheir Taraman

Cairo - Egypt
1998

The present work is a summary of a Ph.D. Thesis submitted to the Johannes-Gutenberg University of Mainz (in Germersheim) (West-)Germany and was published in: *TexTconTexT*, Supplement, Volume 1, Heidelberg : Groos 1986, under the German Title: *Kulturspezifika als Übersetzungsproblem. Phraseologismen in arabisch-deutscher Übersetzung*.

Some aspects of the German dissertation have been summarized in English and published in various bulletins: (i) *Verbal and Non-Verbal Communication in Arabic and German* in: Proceedings, The Fourth International Symposium on Comparative Literature 17th-19th December, 1996. *Language in Literature : English and Arabic Perspectives*, 731-745, and (ii) *Culture-Specifity as a Problem of Translation. Idioms in Arabic-German Translation* in: the 1st Bulletin of the Egyptian Society of Comparative Literature (ESCL) soon to be published.

Translated into English by *Soheir Taraman*

Faculty of Arts, Cairo University, Cairo - Egypt
Deposit No. 16842/98
ISBN 977-19-7682-6
Published by the The Egyptian Society of Comparative Literture (ESCL)
Wordprocessing by Mrs. Sanaa Hafez, Heliopolis,Cairo, Egypt.
Al-Wadi Al-Gadid Press, Cairo, Egypt. Tel.: (020) 3201472

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

To My Parents

Table of Contents

Acknowledgment

The accomplishment of the research work in German and so the present summary would have not been possible without the attendance of seminars and lectures of Prof. Dr. Hans J. Vermeer, held in 1979-1986 at the Institute for Applied Linguistics of Mainz-University (in Germersheim), (West-)Germany.

The main conception of Prof. Dr. Hans J. Vermeer is based on the interdependent relationship between language and culture.

I should like to express my utmost appreciation to Prof. Dr. Hans J. Vermeer for his support and assistance during the preparation of my Ph.D. Thesis.

I wish to reiterate my thanks and appreciation to Prof. Dr. Ahmed Etman for his approval to publish the present work as Supplement, Volume 1, of the periodical of The Egyptian Society of Comparative Literature (ESCL), Cairo, Egypt.

I wish to express my deepest thanks to Mr. Andrew Leslie for his untiring assistance in correcting the English style of the present work and in translating the Arabic speech events given in Appendix 2, as well as the *realia* included in the Glossary.

I wish to express my deepest thanks to Dr. Mona Mu'nis for having reviewed the present work before it was published.

I should also very much like to express my utmost appreciation and deepest thanks to Mrs. Sanaa Hafez for having not spared the time and the efforts in accomplishing the wordprocessing with all kindness and patience.

Soheir Taraman
December 1998

PREFACE

Language is rather an integral and integrated part of culture.

Language "translates" non-linguistic phenomena.

More than any other linguistic dimension (such as the semantic and syntactical), the "cultural dimension" is the deepest structural level of language, and in the process of translation is regarded as a co-determining factor in the question of what, if anything, should be verbalized.

Hans J. Vermeer

The present work discusses the problem of equivalence in the light of the fact that all cultural dimensions are reflected in language.

As far as subject matter, method and analysis are concerned, the research work is primarily concerned with aspects related to the science of translation: The latest results achieved in this field have been applied here, whereby the "unified theory of translation" ["Die einheitliche Translationstheorie"] (Reiß+Vermeer 1984) has been taken as the basis of our method and analysis.

Translation was for a long time, and is still now to a certain extent, evaluated as being subordinate to the original and rarely considered as an independent product. Translation quality assessment thus establishes in most cases either a "loss" or "overassessment" of the original's

communicative value. In this respect, we should like to point out the following fundamental principles of the "unified theory of translation" (Reiß+Vermeer 1984), on the basis of which translation should be defined :

- Translation is a different process of production from that of the original.

- Translation is a transmission of "information" into the TL and its culture concerning "information" in the SL and its culture.

- Translation should not be conceived of as rendering "more" or "less" of the original's communicative value; translation is rather a "one-stage-process" of re-organizing and re-arranging the communicative value of the ST into a new lingual and cultural context in the TL.

Our criticism of translation has resulted in the necessity of emphasizing two other aspects concerning the "ethics" of the translator and the "discrepancy between theory and practice", which have not yet been given great consideration in the science of translation. An appeal to certain rules of conduct on the part of the translator has been made: (i) every translator should briefly make clear in a preface the theoretical basis of the method employed in his translation (Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 99); (ii) the translator should be aware of the 'discrepancy between theory and practice' that arises from not applying the (up-to-date) principles of translation theory in his work.

Situation (in the form of colloquial 'pragmatic idioms', such as speech acts of greeting, condolence) has been taken as the basic linguistic unit of our analysis, and its translatability is exemplified by German

translations of Arabic realistic prose texts. From the viewpoint of the interdependent relationship between language and culture, a hypothesis has been set up concerning the diversity of *situation* value and character in the Islamic-Oriental and German-central European language communities and cultures, whereby we have taken into consideration the social behaviour (including speech) of only the lower classes in the two cultures.

Under the aspect of non-linguistic phenomena as the central topic of the dissertation, *religion, affective communication* (with particular reference to *manual gestures*) and *social structure* have been dealt with as major differentiating factors, as far as the Islamic-Oriental and German-central European cultures are concerned.

The results we have arrived at underline the impossibility of rendering Arabic colloquial speech events into German under the aspect of "functional equivalence"[1] : Arabic realistic prose texts can be only translated into German (and most probably into any other foreign language) by giving explicit indications of their aesthetic and expressive value. Because of the definitively implicit character of most non-linguistic categories discussed here which are reflected in Arabic colloquial *speech situations*, a new function should be assigned to translation; this function can be any other than that of evoking in German a connotative Islamic-Oriental atmosphere of the daily life of the lower class equivalent to that of the original.

The non-linguistic context related to the wide gap between two language communities and cultures, has been generally classified as a

[1] The term "functional" refers in the present work to the communicative function of language of the source text (see chapter IV).

definite problem of translation. To overcome certain difficulties arising from this in the process of translation, a thorough knowledge not only of the source and target languages, but particularly of their cultures is required. This is a consequence of the assertion that language is an integral and integrated part of culture.

Serious consideration should be given to compiling special dictionaries regarding "pragmatic idioms" (as "standard speech situations"), giving not only the semantic meaning in each case, but also full details on the sociocultural background relating to it

Chapter 1 : Subject Matter

The central topic of the present work is the non-linguistic phenomena reflected in language, and the problems of translatability related to it. This has been dealt within a pragmatic framework: a comparison has been made between *situation* (as speech event) in Arabic and German, illustrated by German translations of Arabic literary prose texts. Arabic and German colloquial 'pragmatic idioms' [Pragmatische Idiome][2] - such

---

[2] The subject matter of 'idioms' (Phraseologismen) (for the Arabic term al maskūkāt cf. Hassān 1973, 331) has been dealt within the dissertation under the following aspects:

(i) **General criteria**, such as:

- syntactical structure [komplexe syntaktische Struktur] (cf. Fleischer 1976, 321),
- reproducibility (a-priori character) [Reproduzierbarkeit] (cf. Burger 1973, 1-4; Hausermänn [1]1977, 9; Pilz 1981, 24; Schippan 1975, 111-113),
- langue component [Lexeme] (cf. Pilz 1978, 33),
- syntactic valence [Satzwertigkeit] (cf. Röhrich 1973, 9 f.; Pilz 1978, 34),
- lexical-stylistic criteria [lexikalisch-stilistische Merkmale], e.g. emotivity [Stilfärbung] and the level of language variety [Stilschichtung] (cf. Agricola [1]1981, 23 ff.; Duden 1976, 15 f.; Duden 1983, 15 f.; Friederich [1]1966, 13; WDG (see note 2, p. 21) 1965, olo ff.; for the Arabic terms ad-dalāla l-hāmisiyya and ad-dalāla t-ta'tiriyya cf. 'Anīs [1]1958, 112 ff.) and
- figurativeness [Bildlichkeit] (cf. Rahn 1948/49, 22 and 25-27; Riesel 1959, 183-208; Röhrich 1973, 14, 22-25 and 33; Schmidt [6]1968, 234-237; Schmidt-Hidding 1962, 11; Schmidt-Hidding 1963, 20-22).

(ii) **Specific criteria**, such as:

- idiomaticity [Idiomatizität] (cf. Burger 1973, 29-31; Häusermann [1]1977, 15; Iskos + Lenkowa 1963, 173 f. and 188 f.; Pilz 1978, 773-775; ib., 511-522 and 778 f.: for "Exozentrizität"vs."Endozentrizit", Nida 1959) and

- pragmatic aspect [pragmatischer Aspekt] (cf. Burger 1973, 59; Thun 1976, 246-248; for the Arabic terms al-maqām vs. al-maqāl or as-siyāq al luġawī cf. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz 1982, 149-153; Abūl-Farag 1966, 9 ff.; 'Anīs [1]1958, 42 ff.; Ḥassān 1973, 312 ff.)

As far as the classification of 'idioms' into various groups is concerned (according to one of the two groups of criteria mentioned above), the following classifying scheme has been elaborated, whereby Winogradow's and Černyševa's model of classification (cf. Burger 1973, 19 f.; Klappenbach 1968; Pilz 1978, 443-450 and 459-463; Schippen [2]1975, 122 f. and 124; Taraman 1979, 5-15) has been taken as the basis:

1st group : [phraseologische Einheiten], e.g. salaḥ gildui fattaḥ ʿīnu; liʿb bil-bīḍa wil-ḥagar; ḍarab fī ḥadīd bārid; ruṣī ʿalā barr.

2nd group : [Idiome], e.g. ʿandu bidingān; ʿandu šaʿra; mi'aṭṭa as-samaka wi-ḏīlhā; ʿalā l-ḥadīda; ziyāra ʿalā ḥimār; ḍaraba l-'aḫmās fil-'asdās.

3rd group : [phraseologische Verbindungen], e.g. rakiba l-baḥr; faqada 'aʿ-ṣābu; ġili mil-ġīẓ; kalām fil-hawā.

4th group : [Wortpaare], e.g. qāma wa-qaʿadai lā šuġla walā mašġala; bi-ḥālu wi-mālu; šaḥat wi-naṭar.

5th group : [stehende Vergleiche], e.g. dammu zayy is-simm; zayy il- afrīt; kalām zayy is-sukkar; zayy il-'amar.

6th group : [pragmatische Idiome], e.g. yā sīḥ!; yā salām!; 'išrab mil-baḥr!; ya nhar 'iswid!.

Furthermore, the phraseology [Phraseologie] (cf. Pilz 1978, 784; for comprehensive research on the subject matter cf. Pilz 1978, vols. 1+2; for research on specific aspects cf. Burger 1973; Fleischer 1976; Häusermann 1977;

as speech acts of greetings and condolence - are the basis of our analysis; they are considered as analogous linguistic categories to *situation*.

The following standpoints have been taken as the theoretical basis:

- The interdependent relationship between language and culture is one of the main subjects discussed here (cf. Gipper 1972; Henle 1969, 24 ff.; de Saussure 1931, 24; Vermeer 1978b 2; Whorf 1941).
  Language is seen as a part of culture, and linguistic studies should therefore be considered within the context of *the science of culture* (Vermeer [1]1972, 78; Vermeer 1978b, 2). We are, however, only interested in non-linguistic elements as cultural-specific phenomena reflected in language (cf. Bock [2]1970a, 12; Condon [2]1975, 41 f.; Göhring 1978, 9; Henle 1969, 30; Hemes 1973, 53; Shouby 1951,

---

Iskos+Lenkowa 1963; Klappenbach 1968; Kleine Enzyklopadie [1]1969, 580-600; Riesel 1959, 183-208; Schippan [2]1975, 122-131; Schmidt 1968, 233-245) has been discussed in the form of a comparison between the Arabic and German studies. As far as the Arabic studies are concerned, it has been found that the science of idioms has a fragmentary character and is still considered as part of classical rhetorics, i.e. ᶜilm al-bayān and ᶜilm al-balāġa (cf. Ḥassān 1973, 331; Wāfī [7]0.J.a., 225-243). Idioms are thus described as rhetoric figures, such as kinaya and 'istiᶜara tamtiliyya (cf. Ḥassān 1973, 324 ff.; Ṭabāna [2]1967, 152 f. and 188 f.; Wāfī [7]o.J.a., 225 f.). A comparison between the Arabic and German lexicology and lexicography has been made, whereby comments have been put forward on the Arabic poor achievements done in these fields (cf. Naṣṣār 1956, 715 f.) in order to bring this problem to the attention of the Arabic scholars. Most of the Arabic reference works (e.g. dictionaries, encyclopeadias etc.) do not differentiate between idioms and proverbs; details of lexical-stylistic criteria are almost completely lacking (cf. al-muᶜgam al-wasīṭ 1960; 'Amīn 1953; Rāġib 1943; Sulaymān o.J.; Taymūr [3]1970; Taymūr 1971 Taymūr [3]0.J.).

284; Malinowski [10]1969, 306, Martini 1958, 7).

Religion, affective communication (including *manual gestures*) and *social structure* have been chosen as relevant non-linguistic categories in the consideration of differences between the Arabic and German language communities and cultures. All three are assumed to result in considerable problems of translation into the German language (and most probably into any other foreign language), as far as "functional equivalence"[3] is concerned.

- Culture has been defined as incorporating all possible meaningful behaviour, linguistic and otherwise, prevailing in one society. Culture subsumes the values, beliefs and attitudes shared by the members of that society. It includes the arts and science as well as systems of knowledge about the environment, the past, objects, ideas etc. (Gregory+Carroll) [1]1978, 77) (cf. also Elias [7]1980, 1-8: for the distinction between 'culture' and 'civilization'; Göhring 1978, 10; Sapir 1961, 186; Tylor 1963, 33; White 1963).

- Non-linguistic phenomena form a "cultural dimension" per se which operates more fundamentally than other dimensions (such as the semantic, the syntactical or the phonological) on the deepest structural level of language. In the process of translation, it is regarded as a co-determining factor in the question of what, if anything, should be verbalized (Vermeer 1974a, 301).

- Problems of translation arise usually from a lack of knowledge of the respective source culture. In the science of translation, it is now generally accepted that the process of translation is rather a

---

[3] See chapter IV.

"transmission of cultures" and that fundamental understanding of one language, and effective translation require a thorough knowledge of the source culture (cf. Blanke 1976, 126; Mounin 1967, 66; Vermeer 1978a, 99; Vossler [3]1973, 171). A theory of translation should, therefore, be developed within a "theory of culture" and regarded as a subdivision of "intercultural communication", which is in turn a subdivision of The Applied Linguistics (Vermeer 1978a, 100).

The pragmatic framework of the thesis is determined by two basic principles :

(i) *Speech* is one type of social behaviour (cf. Hufschmidt+Mattheier 1981, 56; Klein 1981, 87; Schmidt 1972, 14; Vermeer 1981, 6).

(ii) language is "part of a social process" (Firth [1]1957, 181), "a type of patterned human behaviour" (Catford 1965,1), "an open ended set of human behaviour" (Halliday 1973, 49) (cf. also Firth 1968, 138; Gregory+Carroll [1]1978, 75; Schmidt 1972, 14 and 16; Pike [2]1967, 26).

Analogously, *text*[4] *and situation*[5] have been considered as relevant language categories within all interpersonal interactions (cf. Klein 1981, 89; Pike [2]1967, 26; Schimdt 1972, 15f.; Vermeer [1]1972, 128 and 132;

---

[4] The following terms are generally applied in Arabic: al-'uslūb (ʿAbd al- ʿAzīz: 1982, 5 and 268-270); al-'anmāṭ al-luġawiyya (Luṭfī 1981, 59-71) and 'anmāṭ al-'asālīb (ib., 135-170). Our suggestion is naṣṣ al-maqām.

[5] In Arabic, the following terms apply: al-maqām, as-siyāq ġayr al-luġawī (cf. ʿAbd al- ʿAzīz 1982, 144-149 and 274 f.; Ḥassān 1973, 336-356) and mawāqif 'igtimāʿiyya (cf. Luṭfī 1981, 59-71).

Vermeer 1974a, 299, Vermeer 1978b, 2). We shall now indicate the most important criteria of these two categories as they are generally applied in linguistics:

- *Situation* is the concrete, determining non-linguistic environment within which all forms of social behaviour including *speech* take place (cf. Bayer 1974, 103-109; Halliday 1975, 25; Halliday 1977, 199 f.; Mattheier 1980, 19).

- *Situation* consists of *verbal* and *non-verbal action* (Vermeer [1]1972, 24, 75, 77 and 128-131). This aspect has always been emphasized by linguists (cf. Vermeer 1974a, 299; Vermeer 1978b, 7).

- Verbal action is present in form of *text* (the semantic unit) which consists of "meaning" and "form" (Vermeer 1974b, 10). "Meaning" in turn consists of both cognitive ["Darstellung (Verstandes-Bedeutung)"] and emotive ["Expressivität (Gefühls-Bedeutung)"] meaning (ib.).

- *Non-verbal action* [6] has been dealt with here under the aspect of gestures; we have restricted our analysis to manual gestures. We are of the opinion that gestric actions help to make the "meaning" of *situation* much more precise (cf ᶜAbd alᶜAzīz 1982, 101; Gregory+Carroll [1]1978, 77; Klein 1981, 101; Pike [2]1967, 29)) and are (especially in Arabic) of an emotive nature.

- Both *verbal* and *non-verbal* communication are normative and are as such accepted by the members of any language community and

---

6 For non-verbal communication in general cf. Condon [2]1975, 97; Jammers 1972; Klein 1981, 98-101: Nida 1964, 30 and 121; Wunderlich 1972d, 101 f.

culture (cf. Bayer 1974, 62-73; Hufschmidt+Mattheier 1981, 57-62; Schmidt 1972, 14; Wunderlich 1972c, 11-58).

- *Situation* is conceived of by Vermeer ([1]1972, 77 f. and 126-131) in two facets, viz. "standard concrete speech situation" ["aktuelle Situation"] and "cultural situation" ["kulturelle Situation"] (cf. Malinowski [10]1969: "context of situation" and "context of culture").

"Concrete speech situation" is of a semiotic structure (cf. Firth [1]1957, 182; Halliday 1975, 25) and consists of variable components such as *field, tenor* and *mode* (Firth [1]1957, 182; Firth 1968, 148; Halliday 1975, 19 f. and 25 f.; Halliday 1977, 200-203; Hymes 1973, 48) (for other various components of *situation* in general cf. Bayer 1974, 119-128; Bayer 1976, 188 f.; Gregory+Carroll [1]1978, 27-63; Vermeer [1]1972, 126; Vermeer 1974a, 308 f.; cf. in Arabic Lutfī 1981, 42-53 and 77-109.

Every "standard concrete speech situation" reflects certain aspects of the respective culture (= "cultural situation") which are here defined as "sociocultural background", "sociocultural pre-knowledge" and "socio-cultural pre-understanding" ["Hintergrundwissen"/"Vorwissen" /"Vor-vers tändnis"] (Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 18 and 152; Vermeer 1974a, 299 and 311 f.; Vermeer 1978a, 100) (cf. also Blanke 1976, 126-135; Bock 1956, 69; Coseriu 1980, 98 f.; Hymes 1973; Paepcke 1974, 9; Reiß 1980b, 64).

- This double character of *situation* stands here in analogy to the relationship between langue and parole, and has been exemplified as such by Gregory+Carroll ([1]1978, 77) and by Halliday (1973, 49) on the basis of Maloniwski's "context of situation" in relation to "context of culture" ([10]1969).

- The relationship between verbal and non-verbal action is culturally determined and thus varies from one language community and culture to another (Vermeer [1]1972, 75, 113, 119-125 and 130; Vermeer 1978a, 99; Vermeer [1]1978b, 6; Vermeer, 1981, 6) (cf. also Halliday 1977, 199; Paepcke 1974, 9).

- *Situation* has also been dealt with here in respect of the absence of certain types of speech events in either the Arabic or the German language community and culture (cf Coseriu 1980, 40).

Chapter 2 : On The Arabic Works

Our analysis has been carried out on Egyptian literary prose - mainly short stories[7] - that have been directly translated from the Arabic language (Hakki 1981; Hussein 1973; Machfus 1978; Ziock 1974).

Literary "realism" (for relevant aspects discussed here (cf. Heselhaus 1969, 363; an-Nassāg 1970, 207-344; Sutschkow [1]1972, 31; Wellek 1969, 419) is the common feature of all Arabic works analysed and evaluated by us.

The authors have focussed their attention on specific social problems of their environment, exposing a variety of socioeconomic conflicts (cf. 'Abāza; Maḥfūẓ 1963a; Maḥfūẓ 1963d; Ġurāb; Ḥusayn 1935). They are primarily concerned with a realistic description of the daily life of the common people. and especially of the lower class (cf. 'Abāza, 59; ʿAbdallāh, 151; Maḥfūẓ 1963a, 186 f.; Ziock 1974, 17 f.).

The delineation of the characters has reached a high degree of vividness by the use of specific cultural denotations (realia) (cf. Blanke 1976, 133 ff.; Petioky 1972, 14 f.; Reiß [1]1971, 77-80:review of realia under the term "Ortsbezug") that are particularly characteristic of this social class, such as ʿaṭfa (Maḥfūẓ 1963a, 186), ḥāra (Ḥaqqī 1981, 7), ḥayy as-sayyida zīnab (Ḥaqqī 1981, 6), hulhal (Ġurāb, 53) qubqāb (ib.; Ḥaqqī 1981, 44) milāʾa [laff] (Ḥaqqī 1981, 78), gilbāb (ib., 26), mandīl

[7] Our classification of the Arabic prose texts under the genre 'short story' is based on aspects such as 'length', 'subject matter' and 'delineation of characters' (cf. Doderer 1957/58; Kilchenmann [5]1978; Röhner [2]1976; an-Nassāg 1970).

bū'ūya (Ġurāb, 53), gubba, quftān, and ᶜamāma (Maḥfūẓ 1963c, 54)[8].

One of the principal realistic features of the Arabic literary works is the fact that the authors have drawn a true picture of the language of their characters by employing the colloquial Arabic language, while the narrative texts as a whole are mostly written in classical (cf. Husayn 1935) or standard Arabic (for the 'realism' mixed style cf. Aust [1]1977, 13; Rohner [2]1976, 238 ff.).

The Arabic literary works have been categorized as "expressive" text type[9], indicating certain aesthetic qualities (Reiß [1]1971, 32, 38 f., 40 and 42; Reiß 1976a, 488; Reiß 1976c, 21). Such a text typology is basically related to the translatability of the respective types of text on the basis of their particular language function ["übersetzungsorientierte Texttypologie"] (according to Bühler's Organon-Model) (Reiß [1]1971 and 1976c). The aesthetic value of the Arabic literary works in question has been dealt with under the following aspects which are here expounded in detail. These are:

- communicative value ["Wirkungsart"]: delineation of the characters according to Islamic-Oriental daily life in respect of their social behaviour, including *speech*.

- textual components ["Wirkungssorte"]: the communicative function of textual components, i.e. colloquial "pragmatic idioms", whereby our method of analysis concerns the relation of the part to the whole.

---

8 For explanation of these realia, See Glossary.

9 The countertypes are "informative" text (such as brochures, office letters) and the "persuasive" text (such as advertisement) (Reiß 1976c).

- expressiveness ["Wirkungsintensität"]: the high degree of "expressiveness" achieved by the use of the cultural-specific phenomenon of "diglossia" in Egyptian literature; this is attributed to the mixed style resulting from the simultaneous employment of classical, standard and colloquial elements.

The interdependent relation between subject matter (socioeconomic conflicts), characters (mainly people from the lower class in everyday life) and their language (colloquial means of expression) (cf. Heselhaus 1969, 363) is the dominant literary trait of all Arabic works and the basis of their qualitative aesthetic value: characterization of members of the lower class in their Islamic-Oriental environment ("primary" textual function ["Wirkungsart"]. This aspect is closely connected with a social criticism made by the Egyptian authors (cf. an-Nassāǧ 1970, 207: al-wāqiʿiyya l-naqdiyya; Walther 1978, 210, 212 f. and 217: Mahfūẓ as social critic), viz. the persuasive intention to change some aspects of the society of which the Egyptian writers disapprove ("secondary" textual function).

The method applied here to the analysis of textual structure (cf. Cassirer 1981, 114: 'qualitative analysis'; Doležel 1967, 542: 'structural theory'; Fleischer+Michel 1975, 365: "das kunstlerische Bild"; Schmidt 1971, 23-31: "Polyfunktionalität) is basically determined by (i) the sociocommunicative function of colloquial speech events (in the form of "pragmatic idioms"), being considered as "textual constituents" ["Wirkungssorte"], and (ii) the sociohistorical and cultural value of these components (cf. Blanke 1976, 133; Breuer 1972, 1.6; Breuer 1974, 37; Cassirer 1975, 43; Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 120; Sanders 1973, 121-124).

The Arabic colloquial "pragmatic idioms" embedded in the respective literary works imply a realistic means of expression of the characters, and

so evoke a certain atmosphere of their everyday life typical of the Islamic-Oriental culture: such idioms are specifically characterized by inherent connotative elements relating to the three non-linguistic categories (*religion, affective communication*, including *manual gestures*, and *social structure*) chosen by us.

The aesthetic value of the Arabic works depends on the use of Arabic "pragmatic idioms" according to their normative colloquial character on the (langue) system level[10]: the originals are, on the whole, characterized by a classical or standard Arabic style occasionally interrupted by the use of colloquial speech events. The result is a mixed style consisting of classical, standard and colloquial elements (cf. Naguib 1981', 121 f.: on Hakki's style). This has more to do with 'diglossia' (cf. Badawī 1973, 53-86; Chejne 1969, 161-168; Ferguson 1959, 325), which is here considered as a cultural-specific phenomen[11] that has no equivalent in German and which is employed in Egyptian literature to attain a high degree of "expressiveness" (cf. Badawī 1973, 67; Diem 1974, 96 ff.; an-Nassāg 1970, 63, 121 f., 209, 241, 243, 295 and 305).

The principal aspect discussed in the dissertation deals with the

[10] For the purpose of comparison, see the individual use of idioms in Brecht's dramas'Mutter Courage' and 'Puntila' with the intention to attain the 'effect of illusion' [Verfremdungseffekt] (cf. Diebel 1960, 20 ff.; Frankhauser '1971, 5 ff.; Grimm 1960, 26 ff.).

[11] This concerns the differing standpoints of the at-taqlidiyyun (purists) (cf. ᶜAtiyya 1944; Diyāb 1919; ad-Dusūqi '1924; Fahmī 1923; ᶜĪsā '1939) and the al-muᶜasirun (modernists) (cf. 'Abi-Hadida 1953, 217; al-Maᶜlūf 1934; al-Maᶜlūf 1936) regarding the legitimacy of the use of colloquial elements in Arabic literature.

"functional equivalence"[12] of Arabic colloquial "pragmatic idioms" in German translation. This problem of translation has been followed up on the parole level (independently of all contrastive linguistic aspects between Arabic and German). Our analysis aims at evaluating the German translations primarily with regard to the aesthetic value of the originals as "expressive text type" (i.e. on the level of the "textual function"), bearing in mind that the "cultural dimension" is a decisive factor per se in the process of translation: the "cultural dimension" determines what kind of function is to be assigned to the translation or what strategy of translation is to be assumed by the translator. In doing so, we have had to analyze the Arabic speech events (as textual components) in their relation to the original as a whole, and to verify whether they have been matched in the German translations by equivalents with regard to the "textual function", i.e. the aesthetic and expressive value of the originals. Characteristic of the Arabic "pragmatic idioms" is the connotative qualitative element "traditional" as defined by us according to the basic non-linguistic categories dealt with here, which express a wide gap between the central European and the Islamic-Oriental cultures. According to our definition, the qualitative element "traditional" covers other elements such as "religious", "emotive", "gestric" and "class-specific"; it is considered as a basic criterion in our translation quality assessment. This inherent qualitative element manifests itself in the originals through the literary device of "realism" by which the authors' styles are characterized.

Effectively, we have had to verify the assertion of House (1977) on the nature of "overt translation" and its countertype "covert translation" under the aspect of the phenomenon of "culture-specifity": according to House (1977, 189 f.), "overt translation" is the outcome of a certain

12 See chapter 4.

process of translation that is determined by a "cultural-specific quality" regarding the recipient and the textual components of the original. A similar assertion is made by Vermeer (1981, 10 f.): translations that deviate in their function from the textual function of the original on the basis of "culture-specific elements" cannot be considered from the standpoint of "functional equivalence" as "intercultural" texts; textually they have in the TL no functional equivalents: the translating process takes place only on the "interlingual" level.

Chapter 3 : Cultural-Specific Criteria Of Non-Linguistic Categories

Culture-specifity refers to the difference between two or more cultures in general, and in the present case to the difference between the Islamic-Oriental and the German-central European cultures[13], here respectively presented by designations such as "affinity for tradition" and "heterogeneity" on the one hand, and by "mobility" and "homogeneity" on the other. Such a comparison is only sought for in order to demonstrate the profound difference between the two cultures within a concept of *relativity*. Pointing out certain cultural differences, we are mainly considering the interdependent relation of socio-cultural and socioeconomic constraints in general and these of the lower class in particular, as this is the very social class that has been the principal object of the social criticism made by the Egyptian authors. For purposes of evaluation, we have employed social indicators such as "traditional" (±), "social status" (±), "mobile" (±), "cultivated" (±), "educated" (±), "capability of integration" (±). The distinguishing features of the two cultures are explained in respect of the "process of modernization"[14], emphasizing its inevitable impact on the social and linguistic behaviour

---

[13] The Islamic-Oriental culture is represented in this dissertation by Egypt, and the central European by the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG). The comparison of these two cultures should be seen above all in a sociological and sociohistorical context (cf. Mattheier 1980, 140-173) and not under a purely philological aspect.

[14] 'Industrialization', 'alphabetization', 'urbanization' et al. are considered as the main factors of modernization (cf. Mattheier 1980, 146-148, as described by H.-U. Wehler). 'Modernization' is the evolutionary process occurring when a traditional system develops into a modern one (Hörning 1976, 11). The term 'modern' is thus identical with 'non-traditional' (ib., 15).

of members of each language community. "Urbanization"[15] and "socialization"[16] are two principal aspects of modernization that have been ascribed great importance within our research work.

The society of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) (and the Western world in general) is usually described as having, to a certain extent, harmoniously developed (cf. Hörning 1976, 17, as described by D. Lerner; Mattheier 1980, 146-148 and 151). "Urbanization" and "mobility" are two significant phenomena of the German society that manifest themselves in the following criteria (cf. Hörning 1976, 39-50: for regional and vertical mobility as consequences of urbanization) :

Firstly, minor differences between the various social classes (cf. Hörning 1976, 41, according to C. Kerr et al.);

Secondly, the relative uniformity of social and cultural conditions (cf. Schelsky [1]1965, 332 and 340: for the "nivellierte Mittelstandsgesellschaft");

Thirdly, increasing capability of integration (cf. Parson 1940, 846 f.: "self-interest" and "self-distinction");

Fourthly, a so-called polarization of "formal" and "private" behaviour

---

15 'Urbanization' is the most significant process relating to 'modernization'. It refers to the lifestyle of mobile individuals in highly industrialized nations (Reulecke 1977, 287); (cf. Helle 1974).

16 'Socialization' is a learning process that enables the individuals of one society to achieve full integration, whereby systems of values, norms, roles, social behaviour etc. are transmitted to them by society or social reference groups (cf. Hufschmidt + Mattheier 1981, 57-59).

(Habermas [5]1971, 184 ff.) (cf. Helle 1974).

The impact of the "process of modernization" is also noticeable in the German language system.[17] By means of a so-called "process of equalization" ["Ausgleichsvorgang"] (cf. Mattheier 1980, 352) the standard language [Hochsprache] has been affected by the colloquial [Umgangssprache], and the colloquial by the dialects, so that the gap between the "written" standard language and the "spoken" colloquial has become minimal (cf. Braun 1979, 118-127; Eggers 1973, 122 f. and 126; Hufschmidt+Mattheier 1981, 56; Mattheier 1973, 352-354; Moser 1979, 65)[18]. "Social mobility" in German society has proved (since the 1950's) to be a strong motive for the choice of the "spoken" standard language as the most accepted and widely employed language variety among the members of this language community (Mattheier 1980, 172) (cf. ib., 37 f. and 50 f.). As a result of the "process of alphabetization" (Mattheier 1980, 117-125 and 161 f.), the awareness of the distinction between "formal" and "private" speech situations has been intensified (Mattheier 1980, 162) (cf. Bausch [2]1980, 360 f.: for "zusammengesetzte Diglossie").

Historical events in Egypt, and thus the process of social evolution, have developed (as opposed to these of the FRG) in a discontinuous

---

17 The conclusions discussed here are basically attributed to results of research works in the field of dialectology (cf. Besch 1972; Mattheier 1973; Mattheier 1975; Mattheier 1980).

18 Cf. the following terms: ["eine an Schriftsprache orientierte nivellierte Einheitssprache"]/["gesprochene Variante der Schriftsprache"] (Mattheier 1973, 352-354); ["eine gesprochene Einheitssprache"] (Mattheier 1975, 365); ["literarische Umgangssprache"] (Riesel 1970, 48); ["hochdeutsche Umgangssprache der Gegenwart"] (Röhrich 1973, 30).

manner (cf. Hopwood 1982, 8 ff)[19], resulting in a heterogeneous picture of society, social and cultural diversity among the community members as well as a quite considerable gap between upper and lower social classes. Moreover, this situation has been intensified by a heavy industrial impact of the Western world, so that the distinction between westernized and Oriental-traditional social classes has become very conspicuous (cf 'Abū Ġāzī 1979, 271 f., Hopwood 1982 165 f and 171 Wielandt 1980 270 and 272; Wikan 1980 17 and 27 Wilber 1969, Chapter 7)

The Egyptian lower class lives in almost complete isolation from modernization and its impact[20]. It has its own subculture (cf. Badawī 1973, 115 and 189) and is characterized more than any other social class by "adherence to tradition" Such a traditional attitude manifests itself in various forms and is seen as a determining criterion for the social and cultural diversity of the country

The Egyptian lower class is referred to in Arabic as *baladī*[21] i.e

19 From the beginning of the 19th century, Egypt was colonized by the Turks and the British; then it became a kingdom with a feudal system which lasted to the middle of this century; in the 1960's it was a socialistic country; since the early 1970's, Egypt has been subject to a system which ranges from socialism to precapitalism.

20 This isolation is somehow compensated for by the interest of the low class in the materialistic aspect of modernization, such as modern appliances (e.g. the television, radio, record-players).

21 The category baladī is complemented by that of 'awlād ad-dawāt which refers to the westernized members of the upper class (cf. Wikan 1980, 27).

"traditional" and "inferior status"[22]. It is, furthermore, associated with connotations such as "uncultivated" or "uneducated" (Wikan 1980, 17).

The social category *baladī* also refers to certain features of appearance (e.g. clothing[23]; head-wear[24]) which indicate the relatively inferior social status of the simple people (cf. Wilber 1969, 47 f. and 104 f.). The lifestyle and social milieu of this social class (cf. Wikan 1980, 86-89) correspond to its social status and are usually indicated in belles-lettres by means of cultural-specific denotations such as darb/ḥāra/zuqāq (see glossary). The social life of these people is governed by conventions and traditions. A strong attachment to Islam is another criterion which is rather based on superstitions and outmoded customs, as far as their original form and content are concerned (cf. Haqqī 1981; Hopwood 1982, 7; Wilber 1969, 71). Cultural-specific epithets such as mᶜallim/'usṭā/rayyis (see glossary) (cf. der Spiegel 1981, 202) are further indicators of the social status of this class. The Egyptian lower class tends also towards affective linguistic behaviour patterns, so that one can observe an exaggerated, fervent type of communication (cf. Wikan 1980, 9 ff.).

The education system has also been greatly influenced by the heterogeneous development of the country; a result of this is the

---

22 It has been found most difficult to translate the term *baladī* into another foreign language without paraphrasing it. This problem is basically of sociological nature: the term is considered to arise from the gap between the upper and lower classes in Arabic countries and as an important differentiation factor regarding undeveloped and developed countries.

23 E.g. gilbāb; ḥulhāl (see glossary).

24 E.g. ṭyqiyya; mandīl bū'ūya (see glossary).

distinction still existing between public and (foreign) private schools (cf. Badawī 1973, 10; Diem 1974), 11-14). al-kuttāb (see glossary) is a unique type of school based on the Islamic-traditional system (cf. Ḥusayn 1935, 28-31; Wilber 1969, 68). In a sociolinguistic treasise, Badawī (1973) sets up a system of Arabic language varieties[25], the so-called al-lahgāt at-tabaqiyya (ib., 8); within this system, the ʿāmmiyyat al-'ummiyyīn (colloquial language of illiterate people) (ib., 89) is regarded as an independent language variety with its own norms and values. The particularly decisive criterion of this variety is its class-specific character, i.e. it conveys by application inherent connotative indications of the social status of the members of this social class. These people are not usually linguistically aware of the distinction between "formal" and "private" speech situations. Their integration into another language variety is thus difficult, if not impossible (cf. Badawī 1973, 192 and 207).

Culture-specifity has been characterized here by the following:
(i) "subjectivity", (ii) "non-individuality" and "expected normative applicability" and (iii) implicity.

---

[25] The system of Arabic language varieties is subdivided into:

1. lugat at-turāt ['Traditionssprache'] (language of tradition) (Badawī 1973, 89 and 119 f.) (cf. Chejne 1969, 8-13; Sūsa 1970a; Wehr 1934a, 1-11).
2. fuṣḥā l-ʿaṣr ['Hochsprache der Gegenwart'] (contemporary Standard language) (Badawī 1973, 9 and 127-129),
3. ʿāmmiyyat al-mutaqqafīn ['Umgangsspracheder Gebildeten'] (colloquial language of educated people);(Badawī 1973, 90 and 148-155).
4. ʿāmmiyyat al-mutanawwirīn ['Umgangssprache der Schreib- und Lesekundigen'] (colloquial language of literate people) (Badawī 1973, 91 and 175-178) and
5. ʿāmmiyyat al-'ummiyyīn ['Umgangssprache der Analphabeten'] (colloquial of illiterate people) (Badawī 1973, 91 f. and 189-193).

"Subjectivity" refers to the relationship between culture and language under the aspect of relativity[26]: language conveys a subjective perception of the world. The way in which reality is seen is basically attributed to the culture reflected in that language (cf. Humboldt [4]1963, 76-81; Seidler [2]1963, 19, 24, 26 and 35; Vermeer [1]1972, 21-48 and 127 f.).

Example 1:

al-hamdu lil-lāh (Praise be to God), a religiously connotated behaviour in response to the question : How do you do?

Example 2:

'in šā'a l-lāh (God willing), an affective speech act of assurance regarding possible future events.

"Non-individuality" and "expected normative applicability" together form a dichotomy. "Non-individuality" is related to *langue*, i.e. a system of conventions, values, norms etc. (cf. Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 97: for the nature of conventions and norms), by which interaction in *verbal* and *non-verbal* forms is controlled (cf. Wunderlich [1]1976, 86-105: for "Ebene der institutionellen Pragmatik") (cf. also Bayer 1974, 62-73 : for 'Konventionalität und Regelhaftigkeit des sprachlichen Handelns'; Scherfer 1977, 73: for 'handlungsrelevante Kulturnormen und-werte im Enkulturation-sprozeß). *Culture-specifity* is thus considered as a "collective" category, establishing conventions for all members of a language community (cf. Porzig [4]1967, 214). "Non-individuality" is,

[26] The principal ideas of the 'cultural relativity' of Franz Boas (1940), as analysed and criticized by Rudolph (1968), have been taken as the theoretical basis of our discussion.

furthermore, described as the "usual" or "customary" manner in which linguistic behaviour occurs, being acquired along with one's native language (Vermeer [1]1972, 33).

Example 3:

> bismil-lāh ar-raḥmān ar-raḥīm (in the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful), uttered by convention at the beginning of any action or undertaking (cf. Lane 1963, 284).

"Expected normative applicability" [Erwartbarkeit] is related to *parole*, and refers to the appropriate employment of speech acts in a conventional manner (here with particular regard to the components "field", "tenor" and "mode" as well as to the cultural setting of situation) (cf. Klein 1981, 90; Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 183; Vermeer 1974a, 309; Wunderlich 1972c, 38).

"Implicity" (cf. MEL[27] [9]1971 ff.; WDG[28] 1975 ff.) concerns the implications of speech events which are perceived although not uttered, described here as culture-specifically connotative components of *situation* generally associated with meaning; in the case of Arabic speech events, these are of sociolinguistic relevance (cf. Example 7).

Culture-specifity has been dealt with here in connection with the non-linguistic categories *religion*, *affective communication* and *social structure*.

The Arabic and German language communities and their cultures are

---

27 MEL = Meyers Enzyklopadisches Lexikon.

28 WDG = Wörterbuch der deutschen Gegenwartssprache.

influenced by these non-linguistic phenomena in different ways. They are, for example, basic features of the traditional character of Islamic-oriental society as well as the Arabic colloquial language, as opposed to the mobile and modern society of the FRG.

3.1 Religion:

Religion is in all its aspects (e.g. belief, rites, way of thinking) still a central social factor in Egypt (as well as in all other Arabic countries). This is a result of the authoritative role played by the Islamic Holy Writ, the Koran, and the Islamic heritage of the prophet Muhammad, al-ma'turat[29].

In the FRG, one can observe a different situation: *religion* publicly and privately plays, to a certain extent, a subjective role, which is an inevitable consequence of modernization. Schelsky ([1]1965, 252, 256 and 258), for example, describes Christianity as "historical category" (cf. also Condon [2]1975, 39 and 111-113; Vermeer 1974a, 315; Wielandt 1980, 379 ff.).

These differing values of *religion* in the two cultures are linguistically of great importance. In the Arabic language, for example, there are quite a great number of speech events that have their roots in the Koran or al-ma'turat and have preserved their religious significance up to the present day, to the extent that their cultural context - usually with reference to Islamic concepts, dogma, rites etc. - is consciously realized by both sender and recipient (cf. Condon+Youssef 1975, 112; Lane 193,

29 Coptic tradition has not been discussed in this dissertation. A great number of speech acts dealt with here are, nevertheless, shared by the Coptic community (cf. Example 1 and 2).

203-211 and 285-313; Wilber 1969, 98).

Example 4:

bismil-lah ar-rahman ar-rahim, (cf. Example 3) the opening formula of each sura of the Koran (cf. ᶜAbd al-Gawwād 1975, 23; Riyād as-Sālihīn [...], 312).

Example 5:

'in šā'a l-lāh, a verse of the Koran (cf. Example 2) (cf. Paret ³1983, 18/23 and 24).

In the German language and culture, equivalent speech acts are lacking; even if some speech events lexically consist of words from the religious sphere, the *context of situation* does not necessarily indicate any religious connotations, the speech events being only semantically relevant within the respective interaction. Such speech events became sociolinguistically neutral means of expression (cf. Moser ¹1964, 44; Paul ⁶1966, under Gott; Röhrich 1973, 15)[30].

3.2 *Affective communication (including manual gestures):*

Affective communication, such as compliments, praise, polite formulas, flattery (cf. Condon ²1975, 102-104) - here with particular

[30] As far as neutral and non-religiously connotative German speech events are concerned, we refer to the following: *in Gottes Namen* (cf. Paul ⁶1966, under *Gott*); *im Namen Gottes* (cf. Agricola 1981, and Wahrig 1966 ff. and 1970, under *Gott*).

reference to manual gestures[31] - is a differentiating factor in the evaluation of the German and Oriental mentalities[32].

The German (viz. the central European) mentality is rather considered to be of a more rational and argumentative nature (cf. Elias [7]1980: for 'Affektkontrolle').

Hyperaffective communication is one of the characteristic traits of the Egyptians (as well as of Oriental people in general), and especially of the lower class.

Affective communication in Arabic and German is examined in the dissertation with regard to the relation of *verbal* to *non-verbal* actions (including *manual gestures*) and with regard to unique *speech situations* in one culture or the other. For example, Shouby (1951, 298) describes the Arabic language as abounding with forms of assertions (tawkid) and of exaggeration (mubalaga). Lane (1963, 206) also refers to the numerous compliments and polite formulas in common use in Egyptian society (cf. also Wilber 1969, 58).

Our analysis shows that non-verbal actions form the greater part of *situation* in Arabic and that *manual gestures* are very common in Egyptian daily life and serve to emphasize emotional utterances in *situation*. In the Arabic language, there are also certain groups of speech events very typical of the (Arabic) Islamic-Oriental mentality.

---

31 For an (intercultural) analysis of gestures cf. Collett 1982; Ekman+Friesen+Ellsworth 1972; Kohz 1982, 111 f.; Saitz+Cervenka 1972.

32 For differences between the Western and Oriental mentalities cf. For 1964, 522; Condon [2]1975, 104; Haqqi 1981, 54 f.; Kohz 1982, 114; Wielandt 1980, 69, 84 and 142 f.

Example 6:

al-lāh yiᶜmir bītak, al-lāh yugbur bi-ḫāṭrak (May God enrich your house, may God support your will), a speech act of "good wishes", which characterizes the frequent and strong desire of Oriental people (especially the lower class) to verbalize intense emotions (such as joy, love, gratitude, subservience), a behaviour pattern typical of the Oriental mentality in general. The *text* is based in form and content on a prayer which conveys the religious belief that only God, the Supreme, can fulfil all wishes. Characteristic of this speech event is the intensification of the state of emotion by means of manual gestures (both hands raised towards heaven).

We are of the opinion that the frequency of (linguistic) behavior patterns characterized by impulsiveness and overwhelming emotion is lower in German culture (as it is the case in most Western countries): in this culture one usually tends not to show one's feelings, at least not in the manner described above[33]. Hence, there is no one-to-one relationship with regard to this pattern of behaviour, as far as the German and Arabic cultures are concerned; in some cases, one can even observe a one-to-zero relationship.

Furthermore, we believe that *situation* in German is characterized by the predominance of verbal actions, whereby manual gestures serve rather to disclose the cognitive meaning ("field") than to emphasize a particular state of emotion.

---

[33] Cf. German speech acts such as *ich danke; ich bin dir* etc. *verbunden; ich wünsche alles Gute* as analogous speech situations to Example 6.

3.3 Social structure:

Our analysis of *social structure* as a non-linguistic phenomenon is based on the assertion that this category is to be considered as an "element of a sociosemiotic theory of language" (Halliday 1975, 28 f.) (cf. Gregory+Carroll [1]1978, 87; Fishman 1972, 1; Firth [1]1957, 185; Spangenberg 1967, 567). This category has been analyzed in the light of a comparison between the social environment of the lower class of Egypt and the FRG. This has led us to investigate the following hypothesis[34]:

Firstly, speech acts of members of the lower class in both cultures have been described in relation to the respective social environment and culture. To this end, we have elaborated a model of linguistic behaviour of *situation* in the Arabic and German language communities and cultures. In the German language, *situation* has been defined as dynamic, as it is basically determined by variable components examined here under the aspect of "field", "tenor" and "mode". In Arabic, "situation" is primarily determined by class-specific factors[35] (such as clothing; head-wear; education; religious beliefs); it has thus been described as a static category[36].

From a theoretical point of view (cf. Mattheier 1980, 22-24 and 90

---

[34] This hypothesis can be verified on a basis of empirical research in the field of sociolinguistics (for an adequate method cf. Ellis 1976; Radthke 1976; Schönfeld 1976; Spangenberg 1967; Stockler-Edel 1976).

[35] See Glossary

[36] Our own observations regarding (linguistic) behaviour patterns of charwomen in the German land Egyptian cultures form the empirical basis of our method (cf. Cicourel 197c; Lane 1963; Wikan 1980).

f.; Vermeer 1974a, 298), *situation* in German has been dealt with under the aspect of "role" (cf. Bernsdorf [2]1969, 902 and 1011, as described by Linton; Schäfers [1]1976, 2) (for the dynamic character of "role" regarding the theory of speech acts cf. Vermeer [1]1972, 129), and has been evaluated as a pragmatic unit, while in Arabic, *situation* is considered as being rather dependent on "status" (cf. Bernsdorf [2]1969, 1011; Mayntz [4]1972, 81 f.) and is thus evaluated as a "class-specific" category, i.e. as a sociolinguistic unit.

Secondly, the above description is found to correspond to the "mobile" character of the society of the FRG on the one hand and the "traditional" and "heterogeneous" picture of Egyptian society on the other. As far as the linguistic behaviour of the lower class is concerned, we therefore differentiate between "mobile" and "static" behaviour[37].

"Mobile" (linguistic) behaviour is characterized by the ability to switch from one language variety to another (cf. Halliday 1975, 21, according to Labov; Mattheier 1980, 95: for the terms 'switching' and 'Diglossie' situation), a fact which is attributed to the multi-dimensional social status of most individuals in industrialized countries. This pattern of linguistic behaviour reflects a so-called "role-repertoire" (cf. "register"

[37] The distinction between "elaborated" and "restricted" codes as well as the 'person-orientated' and 'positional' families as described by Bernstein (1967 and 1972) has been taken as our theoretical basis, whereby all sociopolitical aspects of Bernstein's theory have been disregarded; only linguistic criteria relating to it have been taken into consideration [cf. also "verbales Repertoire" vs. "eingeschränktes verbales Repertoire" (Gumperz 1968), as reviewed by Dittmar 1973, 138; "universalistische Bedeutung" vs. "partikularistische" (Hawkings) as reviewed by Dittmar 1973, 20 and by Gregory+Carroll [1]1978, 81 f.; "mobiles Sprach-Verhalten" vs. "fixes Sprach-Verhalten as elaborated by Vermeer [1]1972, 126-129].

as described by Gregory+Carroll [1]1978, 64-74; Halliday 1972, 94; Halliday 1975, 25), which guarantees a dynamic process of communication and indicates an awareness of linguistic norms (Gregory+Carroll [1]1978, 73); the sender is found to be selective and flexible with regard to the whole range of means of expression provided by his own language community and culture; he is also able to distinguish between "formal" and "private" *speech situations*, so that colloquial language is no longer considered to be the language variety appropriate to public life, but rather as "leisure-time language" ["Freizeitsprache"] (Mattheier 1980, 154). In this respect, "role" is the major factor in the choice between the standard and colloquial language varieties in German. "Mobile" behaviour is, furthermore, structurally described as being logical, explicit and analytical; the use of non-verbal action (viz. manual gestures) is limited to a great extent.

"Static" behaviour is basically dependent on "social status" (as opposed to "role" in the case of "mobile" behaviour); the repertoire of the sender is class-specific (cf. Bausch [2]1980, 259 f. : for 'Soziolekte'; Gregory+Carroll [1]1978, 18-21: for "social dialect"). It combines inherent indicators regarding the social status of the sender (cf. Vermeer [1]1972, 87: for "symptomatische Konnotativseme", according to Vernay 1968); such social indicators are of an implicit nature, i.e. they are not verbalized, but generally associated with the respective *speech situation*. As a result of the inability of the Egyptian lower class to integrate themselves into other Arabic language varieties, and because of its strong attachment to tradition, its "static" behaviour is, furthermore, described as rigid and less individual (cf. Badawī 1973, 189 f.). Therefore, they show indifferent behaviour toward the choice of the language variety appropriate to "formal" or "private" speech situations; here, the rigidity of the social status of these people is a principal factor on which the use of ᶜāmmiyyat al-'ummiyyīn (or at the most ᶜāmmiyyat al-mutanawwirīn)

is usually based. Besides, affective means of communication with particular reference to manual gestures are characteristic of "static" behaviour.

Example 7:

il- ᶜawāfī (contentment), speech act of "salutation" and "valediction", and 'asibkum bi-ᶜāfya (I leave you in contentment), speech act of "valediction": these two speech acts are only used by the lower class. The use of either of these expressions by a member of the upper or even the middle class would produce great astonishment among the members of the Arabic language community and culture. Relatively negative connotations (referring to social indicators such as *uneducated; manual labour*[38]*; inferior status; traditional clothing and head-wear)* are associated with these two formulas. The decisive criterion is the fact that this idiom is mostly used by the lower class, irrespective of the degree of formality of the speech situation, whereas in Arabic there are other speech events that are not class-specific, for example, as-salāmu ᶜalaykum (peace upon you) (standard) and saᶜīda (wishing a happy day/happy moments) (colloquial)[39]. Consequently, the tenor is described in most cases as asymmetric.

So far, *culture-specifity* has been principally discussed in respect of the qualitative element *traditional*, as being characteristic of Arabic colloquial speech in general and the linguistic behaviour of the Egyptian

[38] This applies for example to cleaners, roadmen or house-porters.

[39] In the German language community and culture, there are no class-specific variants equivalent to the Arabic idioms discussed here (cf. German speech acts as *Guten Tag/Abend*! (standard); *Tschuß*! (colloquial) *Aufwiedersehen*! (standard).

lower class in particular. This criterion is understood as a comprehensive unit covering the non-linguistic categories of *religion, affective communication* (including manual gestures) and *social structure*.

Generally, it refers to the adherence to the heritage of the Islamic-Oriental culture in the widest sense of the word. In the dissertation, the connotative element *traditional* is, however, discussed under two principal aspects, namely *religion* (with the Koran and hadit-literature as main sources) and *inferior status* (baladi) (attachment to customs in their original form)[40]. The criterion *inferior status* is understood here as a class-specific qualitative element generally associated with negative connotations, such as *common, ordinary* and *banal*.

[40] 'Traditional' attitude is, however, not necessarily connected with a particular class-specific quality in a negative sense as understood in the present work. It is, socially, a general concept. For example, traditional persons can belong to the upper and middle classes without having an inferior status.

Chapter 4 : Principal Aspects Of The "Unified Theory Of Translation"

The method of translation which we have applied is based on the "unified theory of translation" ["Die einheitliche Translationstheorie"] (Reiß+Vermeer 1984) (cf. also Vermeer 1979; Vermeer 1981).

Accordingly, every translation[41] - independently of its function - is defined as a "transmission of information" in lingual and cultural respects (Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 76). The process of translation is thus regarded as an "interlingual" and "intercultural" transfer. The two procedures are, however, not identical.

"Interlingual" transfer is seen from the standpoint of the "two stage process of communication" ["zweistufiger Kommunikationsprozeß"]: this process is thus referred to as "transcoding" ["Transkodierung"] (Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 33 and 45). "Interlingual" transfer has been characterized by Reiß+Vermeer (1984, 41-46) as follows:

- The process of translation principally takes place on the interlinguistic level. - A "formal imitation" of the ST is the main object of translation; the process takes place on the semantic, lexical, stylistic, syntactical etc. levels, independently of any change in the textual function of the TT from that the ST.

- Cultural phenomena - in respect of "functional equivalence" - are

---

41 'Translation' refers here to the process of 'interpreting' as well as to that of 'translating' (Rieß+Vermeer 1984, 6-17) (cf. the respective Arabic terms: at-targama š-šafahiyya and at-targama t-taḥririyya.

and 110).

The process of translation thus exceeds all linguistic boundaries; it is primarily conceived of as a transfer of culture (Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 67). "Intercultural" transfer is, in other words, a "transmission of information" into the TL and its culture about "information" in the SL and its culture (Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 67). The process of translation is described as irreversible and as a "one-stage process" ["ganzheitlicher Vorgang"], in the course of which qualitative elements of the ST are reorganized into a new context by means of equivalents in compliance with the norms and conventions of the TL and its culture (ib., 64 f.) (cf. Schadewaldt [3]1973, 238).

Translation is a general and complex process, while "interlingual" transfer is subordinate to "intercultural" (Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 79). The relation between the two kinds of transfer is principally determined by the following two factors:

1. Translation is a "one-stage process" ["ganzheitlicher Vorgang"].

2. Every translation is a "transmission of information" into TL and its culture about "information" in the SL and its culture.

One of the principal aspects of the translation theory employed in the dissertation is "the purpose of the translation" ["Zweck der Übersetzung"] (Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 96, 100 and 114): according to this translation theory and with regard to the "functional translation", translation quality assessment is first and foremost subject to the aims of the respective translator. The quality assessments *good* or *bad* must be considered in relation to the final function assigned to the translation.

This aspect is related to the basic principle that translation theory is a specific type within the general theory of social behaviour (ib., 95 and 99). Every translation is , consequently, considered as a different process of production from that of the original (ib., 100 and 103). Moreover, every translator is free to change the function of the TT from that of the ST; therefore, the translator is the most decisive agent in the process of translation (ib., 149) (cf. also Paepcke 174).

With regard to the "functional translation" (which has its foundations in a general model of perception), the addressee has become increasingly incorporated into the picture as a considerably important factor within the process of translation (Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 85 and 101.

Whether one should preserve the "textual function" of the ST (i.e. of the respective text type) or deviate from it depends in the first place on the culture-specific phenomena dominating in the course of translating and which represent the differences between the respective language communities and cultures (cf. Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 19 and 88, Vermeer 1979, 7; Vermeer 1981, 9). Therefore, *culture-specifity* is seen in this respect as a major determinant: at quite a considerable distance between two cultures, a new textual function other than that of the original must be assigned to the translation. Two basic principles, so-called "conditions of verbalization" ["Verbalisierungsbedingungen"], should be pointed out:

(i) Each culture and language represents its own particular structure, within which every element acquires its value through its relation to the other elements of the same structure. Consequently, the value of the respective elements should be (functionally) adjusted to the new (cultural) context into which they are placed (Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 104) (cf. Vermeer 1981, 5 f.).

(ii) The original and the translation are subject to different conditions of perception (Vermeer 1979, 7). In the case of "intercultural" transfer, the conditions of perception applying to the ST should be replaced by others relevant to the TT (ib.) (cf. Nida 1964, 147-149: for the ethnolinguistic model of translation; ib., 179 f.: 'pressures of tradition'; Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 57-63; ib., 84 and 140 f.: for "Zeitgeschmack"; Savory [1]1957, 29: for "literary taste").

Function is here classified as a dynamic, not as a static category (Vermeer 1979, 6).

The preservation of the "textual function"[42] of the ST cannot be taken for granted. Before assigning the translation its appropriate function, a strategy of translation must be set up according to the specific lingual and cultural conditions of perception of both the ST and TT which might determine the process of translation and might affect the quality of the translation. The categories "appropriateness" ["Adaquātheit"] and "functional equivalence" ["Äquivalenz"] are defined as two strategic alternatives of translation; each is regarded as an assessment category per se.

The alternative character of the strategy of translation is based on the dichotomy of translation as stated by Schleiermacher ([3]1973, 47): the translator should either "leave the author alone and "move" the addressee towards him, or he should "leave the addressee alone" and "move" the author towards him (cf. also Diller+Kornelius 1978" "primäres" and "sekundäres" Übersetzen; Guttinger [2]1963: "dichterisches" und "gelehrtes" Übersetzen; House 1977: "covert translation" and "overt translation"; Levý 1969: illusionistische" and "antiillusionistische"

[42] This should be considered in relation to the respective text type (see chapter 2).

Übersetzungsmethode).

"Appropriateness" (i.e. appropriate method to function) (cf. Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 139) is a strategy of translation per se. Accordingly, a specific function is assigned to the translation. This kind of strategy is principally related to "formal" criteria of the ST (cf. Koller 1979, 187-191: "Vielschichtigkeit des Äquivalenzbegriffs"; Reiß [1]1971, 68 f. and 89 ff.: "funktionale Kategorien der Übersetzungskritik"; Vermeer 1979, 6: "metafunktionale Entscheidung: Vermeer 1981, 6 f."Adäquatheit hinsichtlich der formalen Äquivalenz").

The term "formal" refers here to the relation between the ST and TT on the level of "textual components". The "textual function" of the ST, to which all other textual features are subordinate, is considered here as irrelevant. Assigning a different function to the TT from that of the ST according to a particular aim necessarily results in a shift with regard to the recipient of the ST (cf. Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 137).

The category "appropriateness" is related to the process of translation; therefore, not the translation (TT) itself, but the means of expression in relation to the purpose of translation chosen by the translator is to be evaluated as "appropriate" (ib., 139).

Two main types of translation (cf. Reiß [1]1971, 90 ff.: "zielsprachliche Versionen", Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 79 f. and 133-139) are ascribed to the category "appropriateness":

Firstly, translations in which modifications are made in compliance with the norms of the TL and its culture ["nicht-verfremdende Übersetzung"].

This type of translation is in turn subdivided into (i) "adaption"[43] ["Adaption"] (cf. Koller 1979, 165 f.; Mounin 1967, 52 f.; Reiß [1]1971 and 1976c: 'for translation of advertisements'; Vermeer 1979) and (ii) "free translation" ["freie Übersetzung"] such as résumé and paraphrase (cf. Jäger [1]1975, 68 f.; Reiß [1]1971, 93-96; Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 136-139).

Secondly, translations in which no modifications are made in compliance with the norms of the TL and its culture and which is characterized by the use of borrowed words or explanations of culture-specific phenomena occurring in the original ["verfremdende Übersetzung"] (cf. Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 134-136; Koller 1979, 128; Nida 1964, 165 and 172). Such translations are present in forms of e.g. "literary translation" ("wörtliche Übersetzung") (cf. Jäger [1]1975, 68; Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 134; Wilss [1]1977b, 107) and "philological translation" ["philologische Übersetzung"] (cf. Diller+Kornelius 1978, 112; Gasset [3]19773, 319 f.; Güttinger [2]1963, 29 ff.: for "gelehrte Übersetzung"; Koller 1979, 128; Nida 1964, 159 and 165 f.: for "gloss translation" / "formal equivalence translation"; Nida+Taber 1969, 13: for "liguistic translation", Reiß [1]1971, 101; Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 135; Schadewaldt [3]1973, 226 f.; Schleiermacher [3]1973, 45-47; Stackelberg 1978, 70 f.; for 'Rothbauers Übersetzung von Cervantes Don Quijote de la Mancha').

The category of "functional equivalence" is related to a strategy of translation per se based on principles of text typology: on the basis of this

43 al-'iqtibās and at-tamṣīr are the terms applicable in the Arabic language (cf. the Egyptian musicals *al-mūsīqā fil-ḥayy aš-šarqi* (on the basis of the musical 'Sound of Music') and *sayyidati l-gamīla* (on the basis of the musical 'My Fair Lady') as examples for this kind of translation).

strategy, the translator aims at achieving a "functional equivalence" on the level of "textual function" of the respective text type. "Functional equivalence" manifests a relation between the ST and TT, whereby the "textual function" of the ST is preserved in the TT (and remains as constant as possible on all other linguistic levels) (Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 135 and 139 f.).

The process of translation in which "functional equivalence" takes place is described as a hierarchic process, i.e. the "textual components" are subordinate to the function of the text type as a whole (Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 131) (cf. Diller+Kornelius 1978: "primäre Übersetzung". Güttinger ²1963: "dichterisches Übersetzen"; House 1977: "covert translation"; Nida 1964: "translation of dynamic equivalence")[44].

"Functional equivalence" corresponds to the "text typology translating method" as described by Reiß (¹1971 and 1976c) (cf. also House 1977, 188). According to this method, the "textual function" of the text type is the determining factor in the process of translation. For example, the aesthetic value of the "expressive" text type (which is here identical with the "textual function" of the same text type) is the most important factor in the process of translation, as far as "functional equivalence" is sought (Reiß 1976c. 20 ff.; ib., notes 51, 52 and 55, pp. 30-33) (cf. also Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 214). Therefore, any changes made on-the semantic, syntactical etc. levels are legitimate as long as the aesthetic value of the respective text type is functionally preserved in the TT (cf. Reiß 1976c, note 51, pp. 30 f.).

---

[44] The arabic term at-taʕrīb is generally applicable.

"Modulation"[45] (cf. Kade 1968a, 13; Reiß ¹1971, 87) is a process of translation corresponding to the assessment strategy by means of which "functional equivalence" can be achieved in the TT (cf. Nida 1964, 237 f.; Reiß ¹1971, 86 f.; Wilss 1977b, 116 f. and 120 f.).

It would not be, however, correct to say that every "expressive" text type can be rendered in the TL on the basis of "functional equivalence". The conditions of perception ["Verbalisierungsbedingungen"] discussed earlier are decisive factors which should be accounted for in the process of translation.

---

45 "Modulation" is seen here in connection with the "Vorkommensebene" described by Reiß+Vermeer (1984, 33).

Chapter 5 : Model Of Analysis

A model of analysis has been developed in order to examine the textual structure and style of the Arabic works, and to produce a criticism of translation[46]. The following three aspects have been taken as the basis, firstly, with regard to the Arabic speech events[47] employed by the Egyptian authors, and secondly, to their translatability:

- the aesthetic and expressive value of the Arabic prose texts (level of "textual function"), by examining the function of the Arabic speech events in relation to the sociocultural setting of the originals (i.e. in relation to subject matter and characters),

- the emotive and connotative meaning of the Arabic speech events as "textual components" (level of "textual components"), by analyzing them as isolated lexical units (on the langue level) ["kontextfreie Ebene"] and in relation to the meaning of *situation* actualized in the respective original, and,

- the translatability of the Arabic speech events, by analyzing and

---

46 For other models cf. Blanke 1976, 127-132; House 1977, 37-50; Reiß 1971, 69-88; Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 148-153.

47 Only Arabic speech events that have retained their original colloquial form have been taken into consideration. We have disregarded all other speech events whose colloquial form has been modified by the Egyptian authors in order to adapt them to their style in standard language; examples of these are: al-qiyāma lam taqum instead of il-qiyāma mā 'amitš; 'atuṣaddiqūn bil-lāh instead of tiṣadda'bil-lāh; lima kafa s-svarr instead of lih kafa s-sarr.

evaluating the TT as independent "text" on the one hand and in relation to the ST on the other

The model of analysis

(1) ST and TT

ST and TT have been underlined within a comprehensive context cited from the original and the respective translation The ST has been transliterated (cf Duden 1983 and MEL[48] [9]1971 ff under Transliteration: Mounin 1967, 21 and note 9, p. 191; Ronkel+Spies 1935) and transcribed (cf Duden 1983 and MEL [9]1971 ff under Transkription; Mounin 1967, 20) for the benefit of the German reader The ST has also been literally translated into German

(2) The meaning of *situation* on the langue level ["kontextfreie Deutung:][49]

The ST has been analysed and evaluated as a lexical unit on the langue level. With this procedure we intend to demonstrate that the normative (traditional) character of the Arabic speech events has been preserved in the Arabic works. In this respect, the variable components of *situation* ("field", "tenor", "mode") together with the sociocultural setting have been discussed in detail, thus providing information concerning the specifity of their realistic Islamic-Oriental background.

---

48 MEL = Meyers Enzyklopadisches Lexikon.

49 Only the meaning of the speech act actualized in the original (contextual meaning) has been taken into consideration in each case. All other meanings of the same speech act have been excluded.

(3) The meaning of *situation*, sociocultural pre-knowledge, textual functional relevance ["Sinn","Vorverständnis", "text-funktionale Relevanz"]:

The ST is discussed again, this time in close connection with the general context of the original; we have pointed out certain expressions in the original which serve to disclose the cognitive, emotive and connotative meaning of the speech events as well as their aesthetic and expressive function.

(4) Criticism of translation [Übersetzungskritik][50]:

The evaluation of the TT takes place in three stages:

Firstly, precise indications are given regarding the process of translation[51] In our research work, we are principally concerned with the following processes: "modulation"[52]; "literal translation"[53] for quality assessment cf Kade 1968b, 74; Nida

---

[50] For methods of criticism of translation cf. Kade 1968b, 56 ff.; Koller 1974b, 38 ff.; Koller 1979, 210 ff.; Reiß 1968; Reiß 1972a.

[51] The final translation quality assessment is based on this procedure, from which one can infer on a statistical basis what kind of strategy of translation (i.e. whether formal or functional) has been chosen.

[52] Originally, 'modulation' refers to substitution on the lexical-semantic level (Kade 1968a, 13); it is, however, considered by some scholars as a process of translation on the pragmatic level (Reiß 1971, 87; ib., note 33, p. 50).

[53] A distinction is made here between 'literal translation' [wörtliche Übersetzung] and 'word-by-word-translation' [Wort-für-Wort-Übersetzung oder Interlinear-version] (Reiß + Vermeer 1984, 134).

1964, 214; Mounin 1967, 81; Paecke 1974, 8; Reiß [1]1971, 78 f.; Reiß 1976b, 112); "borrowed words"[54], by using transcription and transliteration (for quality assessment cf. Nida 1964, 238; Mounin 1967, 67; Reiß [1]1971, 80; Reiß 1976b, 112; Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 139 f.; Wilss [1]1977b, 105 and 109); "interpretation" (cf. Kade 1964, note 50, p. 100; ib., 96; Kade 1965, 166; Kade 1968a, 15)) and "paraphrase" (cf. Duden 1983, under Paraphrase; Kade 1968b, 9 f. and 73; ib., note 9, p. 105; Reiß 1976c, note 30, p. 104) .[55]

Furthermore, our criticism of translation is based on the assertion that the TT should be first examined as a text per se and then in relation to the ST (Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 113 f.). Therefore:

- Secondly, under the aspect of "intratextual coherence" ["intratextuelle Kohärenz"] (Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 109-113), the TT is evaluated in respect of its understandability as independent "text", whereby the TT is examined as to whether it complies with the norms of the TL and its culture or whether it deviates from these norms.

- Thirdly, under the aspect of "intertextual coherence" ["intertextuelle Kohärenz"] (Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 114 f.), the TT is analysed and evaluated in relation to the ST.

---

54 Characteristic of this process is the use of explicit details (in whatever form) of the borrowed units (cf. Nida 1964, 238 f.; Reiß 1971, 79).

55 Characteristic of this process (i.e. paraphrase) is the use of 'addition' or 'omission' of information, 'modification' etc. (cf. Nida 1964, 227 ff.; Nida+Taber 1969, 167).

Arguments are put forward as to whether the strategy of translation aims at "functional equivalence" or "appropriateness".

Chapter 6 : The Results of the Research Work

In general, we have discussed those problems of translation which arise from the difference between two cultures. The intensity and degree of difficulty of such problems depend on the extent and profundity of this difference (cf. Mounin 1967, 85; Schleiermacher [3]1973, 42). It is widely accepted, however, that no translation can succeed in bridging a wide cultural gap without leaving some traces of the foreign setting (Nida 1964, 167) (cf. Mounin 1967, 85; Schleiermacher [3]1973, 42). The present work specifically deals with problems of translation arising from the diverse nature of *situation* (cf. Reiß+Vermeer 1984, 23; Vermeer [1]1972, 127; Vermeer 1978a, 99; Vermeer 1981, 6) in the Islamic-Oriental and German-central European cultures.

The conclusions we have arrived at are related to the use of *situation* (in the form of colloquial speech acts) in Arabic realistic prose and its translatability into German. The problems of translation in this respect have been found to be quite considerable, as far as "functional equivalence" is concerned. In the dissertation we examined nine short stories (see appendix 1) and 27 examples from them (see appendix 2). The results will be discussed under the following aspects:

6.1 The process of translation[56]:

- The Arabic colloquial speech events have been translated into German by means of (i) free combination of non-standard speech acts (37,03%), (ii) literal translation (14,82%), (iii) borrowed expressions (7,42%) and (iv) standard speech events (33,33%). The first three

---

[56] The results are here based on statistical data.

procedures are considered as "formal" processes of translation (59,26%) as opposed to (iv) (33,33%), which is "functional" process of translation.

The "formal" processes of translation are generally characterized by a strong adherence to the linguistic specifity of the ST, whereby in most cases no consideration is given to the function or communicative value of *situation* in the Arabic language and culture. We infer from this that the translators have not aimed at achieving "functional equivalence"; the strategy of translation chosen by most of them is that of "appropriateness", i.e. the translation is given a new function different from that of the original; this new function given to the TT is described in the first place as a transmission of information about intralinguistic specifity of the Arabic language, with no regard to cultural phenomena[57].

- The cognitive meaning "field" of the Arabic speech situations is to a great extent (62,96%) preserved in the TT. This is particularly related to the fact that most of the Arabic speech acts are "semantically motivated" ["semantische Motivierbarkeit"][58], i.e. the relation between their imagery and semantic structure is transparent, so that the general cognitive meaning of *situation* can be easily inferred from it. The semantic context in which the Arabic speech events are embedded (contextual meaning) is, nevertheless,

---

57 No criticism is made here as to the relative success of their methods (see aspect 3, p. 42 f)

58 This is one of the criteria of *idioms* generally discussed in the dissertation, the opposite of which is 'idiomaticity' [Idiomatizität] (cf. Burger 1973, 29-31; Friederich 1965; Iskos+Lenkowa 1963, 173 f. and 188 f.; Pilz 1978, 773-775; 511-522 and 778 f.).

considered here as a major factor in respect of the understandability of the "field".

- Of all connotative elements relating to non-linguistic phenomena (*religion, affective communication, social structure*), the *religious* and *traditional* connotations of the Arabic speech events are the only qualitative elements that are, to a certain extent, not affected (52%) by the "formal" processes of translation. This is, firstly, because of the "semantically motivated structure" of the Arabic idioms, but also because one can infer similar associative connotations from the whole cultural setting of the originals. On the other hand, the sociocultural. background relating to such religious-traditional connotations cannot be perceived in detail by the German reader through this kind of processes. In most cases, no explicit ethnographical comments are even made on the part of the translator.

Because the qualitative elements attributed to the other two non-linguistic categories are of decidedly implicit nature, they cannot be preserved in the "formal" processes of translation by any means, unless the translator himself provides explanations thereof (in whatever form).

- In some cases, standard speech events of the TL (33,33%) have been employed by the translators, whereby *situation* in general is regarded as the main object of such a "functional" process. Nevertheless, the cognitive meaning "field" of the Arabic speech events has not always been preserved (only 22,22%). With regard to the connotation of the Arabic speech acts (including all qualitative elements relating to the non-linguistic phenomena discussed here), no equivalence whatsoever can be achieved. This is because such qualitative connotative elements do not exist in the TL, i.e. the connotative context of the

text of the German colloquial speech events is far more limited than that of the Arabic speech events.

6.2. *The textual function:*

- We are generally of the opinion that the aesthetic value of the "expressive text type" as such is irrelevant from the viewpoint of translation. Problems of translation regarding "functional equivalence" are here principally attributed to the literary device of "realism", which determines the aesthetic and expressive value of the Arabic works as examples of the "expressive text type". With their literary works, the Egyptian authors aim, moreover, at delivering social criticism concerning their own environment and culture, a fact that makes the quality of the Arabic works considerably more culture-specific. The "realistic" quality, by which the Islamic-Oriental atmosphere in the Arabic originals is determined, is thus considered as a definitive factor in the impossibility of achieving "functional equivalence" in the TT (cf. Walther 1978a[1], 212, 219 and 200: for the effect of realistic subject matter in Arabic literature on the German recipient).

- The realistic Islamic-Oriental delineation of the characters in the Arabic originals is basically determined by the use of Arabic colloquial speech events as "textual components". Our analysis demonstrates that the inherent qualitative element ***traditional*** (in the widest sense of the word), which is largely of implicit nature and is characteristic of the Arabic colloquial speech events, has no equivalent in the TL and its culture: the verbal action of German *speech situations* has not as many connotative elements as the *text* in the Arabic colloquial language, neither is it as connotatively emphatic. Moreover, there are certain Arabic *speech situations* which

are almost non-existent in German (e.g. the speech acts of "beggars" and "street vendors") (see appendix 2). For this reason, the "textual components" of the Arabic works can only be translated into German (or any other foreign language) by the process of paraphrasing, with indications of their culture-specific character and their function[59]. In this case, "appropriateness" (the application of an adequate method to the new function to be assigned to the TT) is the only possible strategy of translation. "Functional equivalence", i.e. the evoking of an equivalent Islamic-Oriental atmosphere in the TT, is therefore excluded.

- The degree and intensity of "expressiveness" in the Arabic works is attributed to the effect of the cultural-specific phenomenon of "diglossia" as it is generally used in Arabic literature. An identical linguistic phenomenon does not exist in the German language and culture. Therefore, the "expressive" effect of the originals cannot be equivalently translated into German (and most probably into any other foreign language) either by "functional" or by "formal" processes of translation. The reason for this also lies in the implicit character of this phenomenon and of the majority of the speech events used in the Arabic works. Only the strategy of "appropriateness" could be of use here, allowing a new function to be assigned to the TT.

6.3 *Ethics related to the translator : The discrepancy between theory and practice:*

On the basis of statistical data concerning the various processes of

[59] The same applies to culture-specific denotations (realia).

translation applied, we have come to the hypothetical conclusion that the translators generally aim at making the specifity of the Arabic language and the sociocultural quality of the Arabic originals, rather than the aesthetic and expressive value of the ST, accessible to the German reader. We have classified their translations as "philological". The method applied by the translators does not, however, quite fulfil this purpose. as no ethnographical comments or explicit indications are made at least to disclose to the German reader the cognitive meaning of a large number of the Arabic speech events. The translators are also to be criticized for not having explained or justified in a preface the strategy of translation applied. In most cases, it is left to the reader's competence and knowledge of the Arabic language and culture to develop his own impression of Islamic-Oriental daily life as experienced by the Egyptian lower class. Under certain conditions, this can lead to misunderstandings and unfounded assessments of the aesthetic quality of the Arabic literary prose texts. We have described this situation as a "discrepancy between theory and practice". In most cases, the translator seems to be still unaware of the purpose of his translation: his work is still to a great extent carried out intuitively and not in compliance with translation theory.

APPENDIX 2[61]

Examples of Arabic Speech Acts

Example 1a	yā al-lāh [Corpus 1] (O God) Speech act of 'astonishment' and 'wonder'
Example 1b	yā al-lāh [Corpus 1] (O God) Speech act of 'astonishment' and 'wonder'
Example 1c	'astaġfur al-lāh [Corpus 1] (I ask God for forgiveness) Speech act of 'astonishment' and 'wonder'
Example 2	ḥallī wi-ʿan-nabī ṣallī [Corpus 1] (Eat dessert and pray for the Prophet) Street vendors' cry
Example 3a	lil-lāh [Corpus 1] (for God) Speech act of 'begging'

61 The present examples are those that have been analyzed in the dissertation. By demonstrating them here, the reader should be given an idea on the basic unit of the research work.

Example 3b	rabbinā mā yifḍaḥ-lak wiliyya [Corpus 1] (May our Master not suffer a wife of yours to be humiliated) Speech act of 'begging'
Example 4	tawakkal ʿalā l-lāh [Corpus 1] (Trust in God) Speech act of 'encouragement'
Example 5a	ḥarām ʿalīki [Corpus 1] (May God forbid you this) Speech act of 'indignation' and 'protest'
Example 5b	'ism-al-lāh ʿalīk [Corpus 1] (May God's name preserve you) Speech act of 'indignation' and 'protest'
Example 6	sī [Corpus 1] (sir) Form of address (used by the lower class)
Example 7	'in šā'a l-lāh [Corpus 2] (If it be God's will) Speech act of 'affirmation' and 'confirmation'
Example 8	yā sattār [Corpus 2] (O guardian) Speech act of 'salutation'

Example 9	raḥma lil-lāh [Corpus 3] (I ask for God's mercy) Speech act of 'supplication'
Example 10	'astaġfur'al-lāh [Corpus 3] (I ask God for forgiveness) Speech act of 'astonishment' and 'wonder'
Example 11	bi-faḍl-il-lāh [Corpus 3] (through God's favour) Speech act of 'thanking God'
Example 12	al-lāh yikrimak yā [ᶜamm Ibrāhīm], al-lāh yugbur bi-ḫāṭrak yā [ᶜamm Ibrāhīm] [Corpus 4] (May God enrich your house, o [(Mr) Ibrāhīm], may God support your will, o [(Mr) Ibrāhīm)] Speech act of 'good wishes'
Example 13	rabbinā yutūb ᶜalīnā [Corpus 5] (May our Master forgive us) Speech act of 'feeling sorry for oneself'
Example 14	rabbinā mawgūd [Corpus 5] (Our Master is here) Speech act of 'consolation' and 'placation'.
Example 15	'itta'ī l-lāh [Corpus 6] (Fear God) Speech act of 'indignation' and 'protest

Example 16 'amr rabbinā [Corpus 6]
(It is God's judgement)
Speech act of 'consoling oneself'

Example 17 'anā fī ʿard an-nabī [Corpus 6]
(I am honoured by the Prophet)
Speech act of 'supplication'

Example 18 lā ḥawla walā 'iwwa 'illā bil-lāh [Corpus 7]
(There is no power or might but God)
Speech act of 'commiseration', 'consolation' and 'sympathy'

Example 19 al-ḥamdu lil-lāh [Corpus 8]
(Praise be to God)
Speech act of 'thanking God'

Example 20 min faḍl-il-lāh [Corpus 8]
(from God's favour)
Speech act of 'thanking God'

Example 21 'itta'ī l-lāh [Corpus 9]
(Fear God)
Speech act of 'indignation' and 'protest'

Example 22 tawakkal ʿalā l-lāh [Corpus 9] :
(Trust in God)
Speech act of 'encouragement'

GLOSSARY[62]

- **ʿamāma/ʿimam** (f. neutral; standard : ʿamā'a/ʿamā'im)[63] :
  Red felt head-dress (similar to a fez); of medium height, half bound in white muslin; worn by members of the religious community (e.g. al-'Azhar scholars); indicates a decidedly traditional attitude.

- **ʿatfa** (f. neutral):
  Narrow street or lane in residential areas of the simple people (of the lower class); synonym for darb, ḥāra and zuqāq.

- **basmala** (f. neutral; no pl.) :
  Abbreviation (contamination) of the speech act bismil-lāh ar-raḥmān ar-raḥīm (in the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful); religious-traditional expression uttered upon commencement of any action.

- **darb/durūb** (m. neutral):
  See ʿaṭfa.

---

[62] Only irregular plural forms are given here, and are separated from the single form by a stroke. Indications are also given as to gender and the stylistic level of the language variety (i.e. whether neutral, standard or colloquial). The literal translation (in brackets) and other alternatives with regard to the colloquial form are given whenever possible.

[63] The indication 'standard', which corresponds to the German term 'Hochsprache', 'hochsprachlich', stands on a higher level than 'neutral', which corresponds to the German term 'normalsprachlich'.

- **gilbāb/galābīb** (m. neutral; m. colloq. : galabiyya/galālīb):
Typical popular traditional men's garment; loosely-fitting, usually with long sleeves; made from light material, of a single colour or striped; worn by members of the lower class; used privately as house attire or night-shirt.

- **gubba/gubab** (f. neutral; standard : gubba/gubab):
Rather tightly-fitting overcoat [as opposed to ʿabāya], with a stand-up collar; worn by religiously-traditionally oriented Egyptian clergymen.

- **ḥāra/ḥawārī** (f. neutral) :
Small, narrow lane in residential areas of the simple people; as compared with darb or ʿaṭfa, it has particularly strong connotations referring to the traditional character and inferior status of the lower class.

- **ḥayy as-sayyida zīnab/'aḥya' [...]** (m. neutral) (residential district [of as-sayyida zinab]) :
District of Cairo with a particularly class-specific atmosphere of the lower class; typical residential district of the simple people.

- **ḫulḫāl/ḫalāḫīl** (m. neutral) :
Traditional article of jewellery worn on the ankles by peasant women; indicates that the wearer is a member of the lower class

- **al-kuttāb/katātīb** (m. neutral) (those who write) :
Islamic-traditionally educational institution for religious studies (until the middle of this century); preliminary stage of a career in theology at the al-'Azhar University; usually attended by children from simple, religiously- traditionally oriented families.

- **mᶜallim/mᶜallimīn** (m. colloq.) (teacher, master) :
  Epithet for men from the lower class who occupy a leading position in their trade (also for the leader of a band of robbers).

- **mandīl bū'ūya/manādīl bū'ūya** (f. colloq.) (cloth with decorative fringe) :
  Women's triangular head-dress with decorative fringe; made from fine, muslin-like material, usually in bright colours; worn in public by women from the lower class.

- **milā'a [laff]** (f. standard; colloq. : milāya [laff] ([wound] [large] cloth):
  Large sari-like black cloth; worn as an 'overcoat' in public by women from the lower class; decidedly class-specifically traditional garment (attributed to the lower class).

- **qubqāb/qabāqīb** (m. standard; colloq. : 'ub'āb/'abā'ib):
  Wooden sandals; used as house-shoes; worn in public only by members of the lower class.

- **quftān/qafātīn** (m. standard; colloq. : 'uftan/'afatīn) (caftan):
  Long, collarless men's garment, open at the front, with long, loosely-fitting sleeves; tied at the side; made from satin-like material, normally striped; worn usually under the gubba [or ᶜabāya] by religious people but also by traditionally-oriented people (e.q. wealthy farmers).

- **rayyis/ruyasa** (m. colloq.) (president):
  Epithet for men from the lower class (e.g. carpenters).

- **ṭaqiyya/ṭawāqī** (f.standard; colloq. : ṭa'iyya/ṭawā'ī):
  Cap-like head-dress made from rather coarse material; worn especially by farmers; indicates that the wearer is a member of the lower class.

- **'usṭā/'usṭawāt** (m. colloq.) (master, helmsman) :
  Epithet for men from the lower class (e.g. owner of a small business), also term for driver (of motor vehicles).

- **zuqāq/'aziqqa** (m. standard; colloq. : zu'ā'/'azi''a) :
  See ʿaṭfa, darb and ḥāra.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviation of periodicals

Daf	=	Deutsch als Fremdsprache. Leipzig
Du	=	Der Deutschunterricht/ Stuttgart
DUA	=	Deutschunterricht für Ausländer, München
FL	=	Foundations of Language. Dordrecht
GAL	=	Gesellschaft für Angewandte Linguistik e.v.
GQ	=	The German Quarterly. Appleton, Wisc.
IRAL	=	International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching. Heidelberg
LGL	=	s. Lexikon der Germanistischen Linguistik
LiLi	=	Zs. für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik
MMLA	=	Magallat Magma^c al-Luga l-^{c}Arabiyya. Kairo
MSOS	=	Mitteilungen des Seminars fur Orientalische Sprachen. Berlin
MSpr	=	Moderna sprak. Stockholm
Mu	=	Muttersprache (Zs. zur Pflege und Erforschung der deutschen Sprache). Mannheim
ZGL	=	Zs. für Germanistische Linguistik. Berlin
ZDMG	=	Zs. der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft. Leipzig/Wiesbaden
Zs Fremdsprachen	=	Zeitschrift für Dolmetscher, Übersetzer und Sprachkundige. Studien zur Übersetzungswissenchaft. Leipzig

(*) Please note the following abbreviations and their translation: Bd./sde. (= vol. vols.); Hg. (= editor); o.J. (= sine anno); o.O. (= sine loco); Übers. (= translator).

Sources:

'Abāẓa, Ṯarwat o.J.: *šay' min al-ḫawf* [Abschnitt 10]; in: ders.: šay' min al-ḫawf; Kairo, 57-60 [s. Maher 1974b].

ᶜAbdallāh, Muḥammad ᶜAbdal-Halīm o.J.: *safīnat'an-nagāh*; in: ders.: *aḍ-ḍafīra s-sawdā'*; Kairo, 145-153 [s. Maher 1974a].

Badawī, ᶜAbd ar-Raḥmān (Übers.) 1965: *masraḥiyyat brešt. al-'umm'aš-šugāᶜa wa-'awlāduha, al-'insān aṭ-ṭayyib fī sitsiwān*: Kairo [s. Brecht [10]1968].

Brecht, Bertolt [10]1968: *Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder*; 10. Aufl., Frankfurt/Main (= Suhrkamp-Ausg.) [s. al-Hadim 1966; Badawi 1965].

Ġurāb, 'Amīn Yūsuf 1979: *ḫulḫāl wahība*; in: Māhir+Murād+ as-Šarūnī, 48-55 [s. Kolbinger+Maher 1974].

al-Ḫādim. Saᶜd (Übers.) 1966: *al-'umm aš-šugāᶜa*; Kairo [s. Brecht [10]1968].

Hakki, Yahya 1981: *Die Öllampe der Umm Haschim*; (Übertragung und Kommentar: Nagi Naguib) Berlin (= Edition Orient. Werke der modernen arabischen Literatur. Zweisprachige Reihe, hrsg. v. Nagi Nagui. Band I) [s. Haqqi 1981].

Ḥaqqī, Yaḥyā 1981: *qandīl 'umm hāšim*; [o.O.] (s. Hakki 1981); [s. Naguib 1981]; [[1]1944?] [Naguib 1981].

Ḥusayn, Ṭaha 1935[!]: *al-'ayyām*, Bd. 1; Kairo [s. Lapper [1]1973]; [1935!] [Sakkūt 1971].

Hussein, Ṭāhā [1]1973: *Kindheitstage*; 1. Aufl. Berlin - Weimar; (Übers.: Marianne Lapper) [s. Ḥusayn 1935].

Ibn Isḥāq [2]1979: *Das Leben des Propheten*; 2. Aufl., Tübingen - Basel; (aus dem Arab. übertragen und bearb. v. Gernot Rotter) [s. 'Ibn Hišām (o.J.)]; [[1]1976].

Kolbinger, Edgar + Maher, Moustafa (Übers.) 1974: *Das Mißverständnis* (s. Ziock 1974b, 210-214) [s. Ġurāb (1979)].

Lapper, Marianne (Übers.) [1]1973: *Kindheitstage* (s. Hussein 1973) [s. Ḥusayn 1935].

Machfūs, Nagīb 1978: *Die Moschee in der Gasse. Erzählungen*; Leipzig (Übers.: Wiebke Walther).

Machfūs, Nagīb 1978a: *Hansal und der Polizist*; in: ib., lo-18 [s. Maḥfūẓ 1963a].

Machfūs, Nagīb 1978b: *Die Welt Allahs*; in: ib., 19-32 [s. Maḥfūẓ 1963b].

Machfūs, Nagīb 1978c: *Die Moschee in der Gasse*; in: ib., 33-44 [s. Maḥfūẓ 1963c].

Machfūs, Nagīb 1978d: *Der Allmächtige*; in: ib., 45-51 [s. Maḥfūẓ 1963d].

Maher, Moustafa (Übers.) 1974a: *Wärme und etwas Tee* (s. Ziock 1974a, 198-203) [s. ᶜAbdallāh (o.J.)].

Maher, Moustafa (Übers.) 1974b: *Ein gewissenhafter Mann* (s. Zioc 1974c, 318-321) [s. 'Abāẓa (o.J.)].

Maḥfūẓ, Nagīb 1963a: *ḥanẓal wal-ᶜaskarī*; in: ders.: dunyā l-lāh; Kairo, 186-196 [s. Walther 1978a].

Maḥfūẓ, Nagīb 1963b: *dunyā l-lāh*; in: ib., 5-22 [s. Walther 1978b].

Maḥfūẓ, Nagīb 1963c: *al-gāmiᶜ fī d-darb*; in: ib., 51-65 [s. Walther 1978c].

Maḥfūẓ, Nagīb 1963d: *al-gabbār*; in: ib., 151-160 [s. Walther 1978d].

Naguib, Nagi (Übers.) 1981: *Die Öllampe der Umm Haschim* (S. Hakki 1981) [s. Haqqi 1981] .

Paret, Rudi (Übers.) ³1983: *Der Koran*; 3. Au l., Stuttgart - Berlin - Köln - Mainz.

Rotter Gernot (Übers.) ²1979: *Das Leben des Propheten* (s. Ibn Ishaq ²1979) [s. 'Ibn Hisam (o.J.)] .

Walther, Wiebke (Übers.) 1978a: *Hansal und der Polizist* (s. Machfūs 1978a, 10-18) [s. Maḥfūẓ 1963a].

Walther, Wiebke (Übers.) 1978b: *Die Welt Allahs* (s. Machfūs 1978b, 19-32) [s. Maḥfūẓ 1963b].

Walther, Wiebke (Übers.) 1978c: *Die Moschee in der Gasse* (s. Machfūs 1978c, 33-44) [s. Maḥfūẓ 1963c].

Walther, Wiebke (Übers.) 1978d: *Der Allmächtige* (s. Machfūs 1978d, 45-51) [s. Maḥfūẓ 1963d].

Ziock, Hermann (Hg.) 1974a: *Wärme und etwas Tee*; in: ib., 198-203 (s. Maher 1974a) [s. ʿAbdallāh (o.J.)].

Ziock, Hermann (Hg.) 1974b: *Das Mißverständnis*; in:ib, 210-214 (s. Kolbinger+Maher 1974) [s. Ġurāb 1979].

Ziock, Hermann (Hg.) 1974c: *Ein gewissenhafter Mann.* in: ib., 318-321 (s. Maher 1974b) [s.'Abāẓa (o.J.)].

References :

ᶜAbdal-ᶜAzīz, Muḥammad Ḥasan 1982: *madḫal 'ilā l-luġa*, Kairo.

ᶜAbd al-Gawwād, 'Aḥmad (Hg.) 1975: *ad-duᶜā' al-mustaǧāb min al-ḥadīṯ wal-kitāb*, Kairo (unveröffentlicht).

'Abū l-Farag, Muḥammad 'Aḥmad [1]1966: *al-maᶜāgim al-luġawiyya fī ḍū' dirāsāt ᶜilm al-luġa l-ḥadīṯ*, Kairo.

'Abū Ġāzī, Badr ed-Dīn 1979: *binā' al-'insān al-ᶜarabī*; in: Māhir + Mūrād + 'aš-Šārūnī, 271-273.

Agricola, Erhard [10]1981: *Wörter und Wendungen*; 10., unveränd. Aufl., Leipzig; [[1]1962].

'Amīn, 'Aḥmad [1]1953 [!]: *qāmūs al-ᶜādāt wat-taqālīd wa taᶜābīr al-miṣriyya*; 1. Aufl., Kairo.

'Anīs, 'Ibrāhīm [2]1958: *dalālat al-'alfāẓ*; 1. Aufl., Kairo.

ᶜAṭiyya, Rašīd 1944: *ad-dalīl 'ilā murādif al-ᶜāmmī wad daḫīl*; Beirut.

Aust, Hugo [1]1977: *Literatur des Realismus*; 1. Aufl., Stuttgart.

Badawī, Muḥammad as-Saᶜīd 1973: *mustawayāt al-ᶜarabiyya l-muᶜāṣira fī miṣr. baḥṯ fī ᶜilāqat al-luġa bil-ḥaḍāra*; Kairo.

Bausch, Karl-Heinz [2]1980: *Soziolekt*; in: LGL, 358-363.

Bayer, Klaus 1974: *Sprechen und Situation. Methodologische Vorüberlegungen zu einer Theorie der sprachlicnen Interaktion mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Situationsbegriffs*; Diss., Deidelberg; [= Tübingen 1977 (Germanistische Linguistik 6)].

Bayer, Klaus 1976: *Plädoyer für eine situationstheoretische Pragmatik*; in: ZGL 4, 179-189.

Bernsdorf, Wilhelm (Hg.) [2]1969: *Wörterbuch der Soziologie*; 2., neubearb. u. erw. Ausg., Stuttgart; [1959].

Bernstein, Basil 1967: *The role of speech in the development and transmission of culture*; in: Gordon J. Klopf+William A. Hohman (eds.): Perspectives on learning. Papers from the Bank Street-Fiftieth Anniversary Invitational Symposium; New York.

Bernstein, Basil [1]1972: *Studien zur sprachlichen Sozialisation*; 1. Aufl., Düsseldorf; [London [1]1971, als Bd. IV der von B. Bernstein hrsg. Reihe "Primary socialization, language and education", unter dem Titel 'class, codes and control', Vol. I].

Besch, Werner 1972: *Zur Untersuchung der Ausgleichsvorgänge in der gesprochenen Sprache*; in: Rheinische Vierteljahresblätter 36, 292-299.

Besch, Werner (Hg.) 1981: *Sprachverhalten in ländlichen Gemeinden. Ansätze zur Theorie und Methode*. Forschungsbericht Erp-Projekt, Bd. 1; Berlin.

Blanke, Gustav H. 1976: *Der Platz der kulturwissenschaftlichen Auslandsstudien in der Ausbildung von Übersetzern und Dolmetschern* (1975); in: Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens.

Referate und Diskussionsbeiträge des internationalen Kolloquiums am Fachbereich Angewandte Sprachwissenschaft der Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz in Germersheim (2.-4. Mai 1975), Reihe A, Bd. 6; Frankfurt/Main, 124-137.

Bock, Philip K. (Hg.) 1970a: *A reader in modern cultural anthropology*; New York.

Bock, Werner 1956: *Über das Unübersetzbare in der Dichtung*; in: Deutsche Akademie fur SPrache und Dichtung, 67-71.

Braun, Peter 1979: *Tendenzen in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*; Stuttgart- Berlin - Köln - Mainz.

Breuer, Dieter 1972: *Vorüberlegungen zu einer pragmatischen Textanalyse*; in: Wirkendes Wort 22, 1-23.

Breuer, Dieter 1974: *Einführung in die pragmatische Texttheorie*; München.

Brinkmann, Richard (Hg.) 1969: *Begriffsbestimmuns des literarischen Realismus*; Darmstadt.

Brower, Reuben Arthur (ed.) 1959: *On translation*; Cambridge, Mass. (= Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, 23); [New York [2]1966].

Büchmann, Georg 1958: *Geflügelte Worte und Zitatenschatz*; völlig durchges., verb. u. erw. Neuausg., Stuttgart; [[1]1864?; [4]1961] .

Burger, Harald (unter Mitarb. von Harald Jaksche) 1973: *Idiomatik des Deutschen*; Tübingen (= Germanistische Arbeitshefte Nr. 16).

Cassirer, Peter 1975: *On the place of stylistics*; in: Style and text. Studies presented to Nils Erik Enkvist; Stockholm, 27-48.

Cassirer, Peter 1981: *Regeln der alltäglichen Konversation der interpretativen Stilistik*; in: LiLi 11.43/44, 110-132.

Catford, J.C. 1965: *A linguistic theory of translation. An essay in applied linguistics*; London; [²1967].

Chejne, Anwar G. 1969: *The Arabic language. Its role in history*; Minneapolis.

Cicourel, Aaron V. ¹1970: *Methode und Messung in der Soziologie*; Frankfurt/Main (Original title: Method and measurement in sociology; Übers. v. Frigga Hang).

Collett, Peter ¹1982: *Meetings and misunderstandings*; in: Stephen Bochner (Hg.): Cultures and contact. Studies in cross-cultural interaction; Oxford - New York Paris - Toronto - Sydney - Frankfurt/Main, 81-98.

Condon, John C. ²1975: *Semantics and communication*; New York; [¹1966].

Condon, John + Yousef, Fathi S., 1975: *An Introduction to intercultural communication*; Indianapolis - New York.

Coseriu, Eugenio 1980: *Textlinguistik*. Eine Einführuns; Tübingen (= Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik, hrsg. v. Gunter Narr, 109).

Diebel, Gisela 1960: *Das Prinzip der Verfremdung in der Sprachgestaltung Bertolt Brechts. Untersuchungen zum Sprachstil seiner*

epischen Dramen; Diss.; Bonn.

Diem, Werner 1974: *Hochsprache und Dialekt im Arabischen. Untersuchungen zur heutigen arabischen Zweisprachigkeit*; Wiesbaden (= Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes. Im Auftrag der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, hrsg. v. Ewald Wagner, XLI, 1).

Diller, Hans-Jürgen + Kornelius, Joachim 1978: *Linguistische Probleme der Übersetzung*; Tübingen (= Anglistische Arbeitshefte, Nr. 19).

Dittmar, Norbert 1973: *Soziolinguistik*. Exemplarische und kritische Darstellung ihrer Theorie, Empirie und Anwendung (mit kommentierter Bibliographie); Frankfurt/Main (= Schwerpunkte Linsuistik und Kommunikationswissenschaft, Bd. 4).

Diyāb, Muḥammad 1919: *muʿgam al-'alfāẓ*; [o.O.].

Doderer, Klaus 1957/58: *Die Kurzgeschichte als literarische Form*; in: Wirkendes Wort 8, 90-100.

Doležel, Lubomír 1967: *The typology of the narrator. Point of view in fiction*; in: To honor Roman Jakobson. Essays on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, 11 October 1966, vol. I; The Hague - Paris, 541-552.

Duden 1976 ff.: *Das große Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, in 6 Bde.; hrsg. unter Leitung v. Günther Drosdowski, Mannheim - Wien - Zürich.

Duden 1983: *Deutsches Universalwörterbuch*; hrsg. unter Leitung v; Günther Drosdowski, Mannheim - Wien - Zürich.

ad-Dusūqī, Muḥammad ʿAlī [1]1924: *tahḏib al-'alfāẓ al-ʿāmmiyya*, Bd. 1; 1. Aufl., [o.O.].

Eggers, Hans 1973: *Deutsche Sprache im 20. Jahrhundert*; München .

Ekman, Paul + Friesen, Wallace V. + Ellsworth, Phoebe 1972: *Gesichtssprache. Wege zur Objektivierung menschlicner Emotionen*; Wien - Köln - Graz; (aus dem Amerikanischen übertragen v. Beate Minsel + Alfred Stabel).

Elias, Norbert [7]1980: *Über den Prozeß der Zivilisation. Soziogenetische und psychogenetische Untersuchungen*, Bd. 1: Wandlungen des Verhaltens in den weltlichen Oberschichten des Abendlandes; 7. Aufl., Frankfurt/ Main (= Suhrkamp Taschenbuch Wissenschaft 158).

Ellis, Stanley 1976: *Regional, social and economic influences on speech*: Leeds university studies; in: Viereck, 93-103.

Fahmī, Ḥalīm 1923: *al-muḥarraf wal-ʿāmmī (gadāwil)*; [o.O.].

Firth, J.F. [1]1957: *Papers in linguistics 1934-1951*; 1st ed., London - New York - Toronto; [reprinted 1958, 1961, 1964 and 1969].

Firth, J.R. 1968: *Selected papers of J.R. Firth 1952-59*; ed. by F.R. Palmer, London.

Fisman, Joshua A. 1972: *Language in sociocultural change*; selected and introduced by Anwar S. Dil, Standford, California.

Fleischer, Wolfgang 1976: *Zum Verhältnis von Phraseologie und Wortbildung im Deutschen* (1975); in : DaF 13.6, 321-330 .

Fleischer, Wolfsang + Michel, Georg [1]1975: *Stilistik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*; 1. Aufl., Leipzig.

Foa, Uriel G. 1964: *Cross-cultural similarity and cifrerence in interpersonal behavior*; in: Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 68. 517-522

Frankhauser, Gertrud [1]1971 *Verfremdung als Stilmittel vor und bei Brecht*; 1. Aufl., Tübingen (= das wissenschaftliche Arbeitsbuch VI/16).

Friederich, Wolf 1965: *Was sind "idiomatische Redewendungen"?*; in: Idioma II, 61-63

Friederich, Wolf 1966 *Moderne deutsche Idiomatik. Systematisches Wörterbuch mit Definitionen und Beispielen*; 1. Aufl., München.

Gasset, Jose Ortega y [3]1973: *Glanz und Elend der Übersetzung* (1937); in: Störig, 296-321

Gipper, Helmut 1972: *Gibt es ein sprachliches Relativitätsprinzip?* Untersuchungen zur Sapir-Whorf-Hypothese; Frankfurt/Main.

Göhring, Heinz 1978: *Interkulturelle Kommunikation: Die Überwindung der Trennung von Fremdsprachen- und Landeskundeunterricht durch einen integrierten Fremdverhaltensunterricht* (1977); in: Rongreßberichte der 8. Jahrestagung der GAL, Stuttgart, 9-14.

Gregory, Michael + Carroll, Susanne [1]1978: *Language and situation. Language varieties and their social contexts*; 1st ed., London - Henley - Boston.

Grimm, Reinhold 1960: Bertolt Brecht. *Die Struktur seines Werkes*; in: Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach-und Kunstwissenschaft, Bd. V, Nürnberg, 26-84.

Güttinger, Fritz [2]1963: *Zielsprache. Theorie und Technik des Übersetzens*; 2. Aufl., Zürich.

Habermas, Jürgen [5]1971: *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit. Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*; 5. Aufl., Neuwied - Berlin; [[1]1962].

Häusermann, Jürg [1]1977: *Phraseologie. Hauptprobleme der deutschen Phraseologie auf der Basis sowjetischer Forschungsergebnisse*; 1. Aufl., Tübingen.

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood 1973: *Explorations in the functions of language*; London.

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood 1975: *Language as social semiotic: Towards a general sociolinguistic theory*; in: Adam Makkai + Valere Becher Makkai (eds.): The first Lacus Forum, Columbia, South Carolina, 17-46.

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood 1977: *Text as semantic choice in social contexts*; in: Teun A. van Dijk + Janos S. Petöfi (eds.): Grammars and descriptions (Studies in text theory and text analysis); Berlin - New York, 176-225.

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood + McIntosh, Angus + Strevens, Peter 1972: *Linguistik, Phonetik und Sprachunterricht*; Heidelberg; (Übers.: Hans Dieter Steffens).

Hassān, Tammām 1973: *al-luġa l-ʿarabiyya. maʿnāhā wamabnāhā*; Kairo.

Helle, Horst Jürgen 1974: *Der urabinisierte Mensch?*; in: Hermann Graser (Hg.): Urbanistik; München, 13-27 (= Beckische schwarze Reihe 115).

Henle, Paul (Hg.) 1969: *Sprache, Denken, Kultur*; Frankfurt/Main; (aus dem Amerikanischen v. Roland Pelzer+Friedhelm Herborth); [Original: 1958].

Heselhaus, Clemens 1969: *Das Realismusproblem [zuerst 1959]*; in: Brinkmann, 337-364.

Hörning, Karl H. 1976: *Gesellschaftliche Entwicklung und soziale Schichtung. Vergleichende Analyse gesellschaftlichen Struktuwandels;* München (= UTB 624).

Hopwood, Dereck 1982: *Egypt: Politics and society 1945-1981*; London - Boston - Sydney.

House, Juliane 1977: *A model for translation quality assessment*; Tübingen; [²1981 (= Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 88)].

Hufschmidt, Jochen 1981: *Überlegungen zur Erhebung von non-verbalem Verhalten im Erp-Projekt*; in: Besch, 206-213.

Hufschmidt, Jochen + Mattheier, Klaus 1981: *Sprache und Gesellschaft. Überlegungen zu einer integierenden Beschreibung*; in: Besch, 43-83.

von Humbolt, Wilhelm [4]1963: *Schriften zur Sprachphilosophie*, Bd. 3;4., unveränd. Aufl., Darmstadt.

Hymes, Dell 1973: *Toward ethnographies of communication*; in: Michael H. Prosser + William J. Starosta (eds.): Intercommunication among nations and peoples; New York - San Francisco - London, 45-66.

ʿĪsā, Aḥmad [1]1939: *al-muḥkam fī ʾuṣūl al-ʿāmmiyya*; 1. Aufl., Kairo.

Iskos, A. Markovna + Lenkowa, A. Fal'kovna 1963: *Deutsche Lexikologie für pädagogische Hochschulen und Fremdsprachenfakuitäten*; Diss., Leningrad.

Jäger, Gert [1]1975: *Translation und Translationslinguistik*; 1. Aufl., Halle (Saale)

Jammers, Ewald 1972: *Die Wahrheit der Sprache und die Musik in der mittelalterlichen (ahdt.) Dichtung. Eine Übersicht*; in: Wilm Pelters+Paul Schimmelpfennig (Hgg.): Wahrheit und Sprache. Fs. für Bert Nagel zum 65. Geburtstag, am 27. August 1972, Göppingen, 15-33.

Kade, Otto 1964: *Ist alles übersetzbar?*; in: Zs. Fremdsprachen, Heft 1, 84-100.

Kade, Otto 1965: *Zu einigen Grundlacen der allgemeinen Übersetzungstheorie*; in: Zs. Fremdsprachen, Heft 3, 163-177.

Kade, Otto 1968a: *Kommunikationswissenschaftliche Probleme der Translation*; in: Beihefte zur Zs. Fremdsprachen, Heft 2, 3-19.

Kade, Otto 1968b: *Zufall und Gesetzmäßigkeit in der Übersetzung*; in: Beihefte zur Zs. Fremdsprachen, Heft 2; [= Leipzig 1968].

Kilchenmann, Ruth J. [5]1978: *Die Kurzgeschichte. Formen und Entwicklung*; 5., unveränd. Aufl., Stuttgart - Berlin - Köln - Mainz.

Klappenbach, Ruth 1968: *Probleme der Phraseologie*; in: wiss. Zs. der Karl Marx-Universität 17.2/3, 221-227.

Klein, Eva 1981: *Situation und Text. Konzeption und theoretischer Rahmen des Erp-Projektes*; in: Besch, 84-138.

Kleine Enzyklopädie [1]1969: *Die deutsche Sprache*, 2 Bde .; 1. Aufl., Leipzig.

Kohz, Armin 1982: *Linguistische Aspekte des Anredeverhaltens. Untersuchungen am Deutschen und Schwedischen*; Tübingen.

Koller, Werner 1974: *Anmerkungen zu Definitionen des Übersetzungs "vorgangs" und zur Übersetzungskritik* (1972); in: Wolfram Wilss + Gisela Thome (Hgg.): Aspekte der theoretischen, sprachpaarenbezogenen und angewandten Sprachwissenschaft; Saarbrücken, 35-45.

Koller, Werner 1979: *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*; Heidelberg (= UTB 819); [[2]1983].

Lane, Edward 1963: *The manners and customs of the modern Egyptians*; London, (introduced by M. Saad El-Din); [Die Ausg. gibt denText von

[2]1860 wieder; vgl. [1]1836; [3]1908].

Levý, Jiři 1969: *Die literarische Übersetzung. Theorie einer Kunstgattung*; Frankfurt/Main - Bonn; [Original: Prag 1963].

Lexikon der Germanistischen Linguistik [LGL] [2]1980: Hrsg. v. Hans Peter Althaus, Helmut Henne u.a., 2., vollständig neu bearb. u. erw. Aufl., Tübingen; [[1]1973].

Luṭfī, Muṣṭafā 1981: *al-luġa l-ʿarabiyya fī ʾiṭārihā l-ʾigtimāʿi. dirāsa fī ʿilm al-luġa l-ḥadīṯ*; Beirut (=ad-dirāsat al-ʾinsāniyya 2, taḥdīṯ'al-luġa l-ʿarabiyya).

Malinowski, Bronislaw [10]1969: *The problem of meaning in primitive languages*; in: Supplement 1 to C.K. Odgen + I.A. Rechards: The meaning of meaning; London, 296-336; [[1]1923].

Martini, Fritz 1958: *Zum Geleit*; in: Büchmann, 7-10.

Mattheier, Klaus J. 1973: *Funktionswancel der Mundart*; in: Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter 17, 348-356.

Mattheier, Klaus J. 1975: *Diglossie und Sprachwandel*; in: Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter 39, 358-371.

Mattheier, Klaus J. 1980: *Pragmatik und Soziologie der Dialekte. Einfuhrüng in die kommunikative Dialektologie des Deutschen*; Heidelberg (= UTB 994).

Mayntz, Renate [4]1972: *Gedanken und Ergebnisse zur empirischen Feststellung sozialer Schichten*; in: Rene König (Hg.): Kölner Zs. für

Soziologie u. Sozialpsychologie, Sonderheft 1, 4. Aufl., 79-104.

Meyers Enzyklopädisches Lexikon [MEL] ^{9}1971 ff.: In 25 Bde.; neunte, völlig neu bearb. Aufl., Mannheim - Wien Zürich.

Moser, Hugo ^{1}1964: *Sprache und Religion. Zur muttersprachlichen Erschließung des religiösen Bereichs*; 1. Aufl., Düsseldorf.

Moser, Hugo 1979b: *Wohin steuert das heutige Deutsch? Triebkräfte im Sprachgeschehen der Gegenwart*; in: Peter Braun (Hg.): Deutsche Gegenwartssprache; München, 49-68.

Mounin, Georges 1967: *Die Übersetzung. Geschichte, Theorie, Anwendung*; München; (Übers.: Harro Stammerjohann).

al-muᶜgam al-wasīṭ 1960: 2 Bde.; Kairo.

an-Nassāg, Sayid Ḥāmid 1970: *'it-tigāhāt al-qiṣṣa l-miṣriyya l-qaṣīra*; Kairo (= maktabit ad-dirāsāt al-'adabiyya 74).

Naṣṣār, Ḥusayn Muḥammad 1956: *al- muᶜgam al-ᶜarabī. nas'atuh wa-taṭawwuruh*, Bd.2; Kairo.

Nida, Eugene A. 1959: *Principles of translation as exemplified by Bible translating*; in: Brower, 11-31.

Nida, Eugene A. 1964: *Toward a science of translating. With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*; Leiden.

Nida, Eugene A. + Taber, Charles, R. 1969: *The theory and practice of translation*; Leiden.

Paepcke, Fritz 1974: *Verstehen - entscheiden - übersetzen*; in: Mitteilungsblatt für Dolmetscher und Übersetzer, 20.6, 7-10.

Parsons, Talcott 1940: *An analytical approach of the theory of social stratification*; in: The American Journal of Sociology, vol. XLV, No. 6, 841-362.

Paul, Hermann [6]1966: *Deutsches Wörterbuch*; 6. Aufl., unveränd. Studienausg. nach der 5. völlig neu bearb. und erw. Aufl. [[1]1897; [2]1908; [3]1921; [4]1935; [5]1966].

Petioky, Viktor 1972: *Kultur und Realien in der Übersetzer und Dolmetscherausbildung*; in: Moderne Sprachen 16, 13-24.

Pike, Kenneth Lee [2]1967: *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior*; 2nd revised ed., The Hague - Paris; [[1]1954-1960, 3 Bde.].

Pilz, Klaus Dieter 1978: *Phraseologie. Versuch einer interdisziplinären Abgrenzung, Begriffsbestimmung und Systematisierung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, 2 Bde.; Göppingen (Diss. Bochum 1977) (= Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik Nr. 239).

Pilz, Klaus Dieter 1981: *Phraseologie. Redensartenforschung*; Stuttgart (= Sammlung Metzler Bd. 198).

Porzig, Walter [4]1967: *Das Wunder der Sprache. Probleme, Methode und Ergebnisse der modernen Sprachwissenschaft*; Bern - München; [Bern

1950; 1957; 1971].

Radthke, Ingulf I. 1976: *Stadtsprache? Überlegungen zu einem historisch gewachsenen Forschungsdesiderat*; in: Viereck, 29-48.

Rāġib, Fayqa Ḥusayn [1]1943: *ḥadā'iq al-'amṯāl al-ʿāmmiyya*, Bd. 2; 1. Aufl., Kairo.

Rahn, Fritz 1948/49: *Die Redensart - ein Kapitel Sprachkunde*; in: DU 1.4, 22-38; [= in: Die Volksschule. Langensalzy, 27 (1931), 970-980].

Reiß, Katharina 1968: Grundlagen der Ubersetzungskritik; in: Lebende Sprachen 13.45;, 139-141.

Reiß, Katharina [1]1971: *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik. Kategorien und Kriterien für eine sachgerechte Beurteilung von Übersetzungen*; München (= Hueber Hochschulreihe 12); [[2]1978].

Reiß, Katharina 1976a: *Das Textsortenproblem aus angewandt-linguistischer Sicht*; in: Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens, Reihe A, Bd. 6, 12-32.

Reiß, Katharina 1976b: *Didaktik des Übersetzens, Integration der Sprachwissenschaft in den Übersetzungsunterricht*; in: Linguistica Antverpiensia 10, 111-131.

Reiß, Katharina 1976c: *Texttyp und Übersetzunasmethode. Der operative Text*; Kronberc/Ts. (= Monographien Literatur, Sprache, Didaktik 11); [Nachdr. Heidelberg 1983].

Reiß, Katharina 1980b: *Zeichen oder Anzeichen? Probleme der AS-Textanalyse im Blick auf die Üersetzung*; in: Wilss 1980, 63-72.

Reiß, Katharina + Vermeer, Hans J. 1984: *Grundleaung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*; Tübingen (= Linguistische Arbeiten 147).

Reulecke, Jürgen 1977: *Sozio-ökonomische Bedingungen und Folgen der Verstädterung in Deutschland*; in: Zs. für Stadtgeschichte, Stadtsoziologie und Denkmalspflege 4, 269-287.

Riesel, Elise 1959: *Stilistik der deutschen Sprache*; Moskau; [[2]1963].

Riesel, Elise 1970: *Der Stil der deutschen Alltagsrede; Leipzig* (= Sprache und Literatur. Sprachwissenschaft. Reclams Universal-Bibliothek 376): [zuerst russ. 1964].

Riyād aṣ-Ṣālihīn o.J.: *min kalām sayyid al-mursalīn*; Beirut, (zusammensestellt von ʾAbī Zakariyyā Yaḥyā b. Saraf 'an-Nawāwī).

Röhrich, Lutz 1973: *Lexikon der sprichwörtlichen Redensarten*, 2 Bde.; Freiburg - Basel - Wien.

Rohner, Ludwis [2]1976: *Theorie der Kurzgeschichte*; 2. verb. Aufl., Wiesbaden.

van Ronkel, Ph.S. + Spies, Otto 1935: *Die Transliteration der arabischen Schrift in ihrer Anwendung auf die Hauptliteratursprachen der islamischen Welt*; Leipzig (Denkschrift dem 19. Internationalen Orientalistenkongreß in Rom).

Rudolph, Wolfgang 1968: *Der kulturelle Relativismus. Kritische Analyse einer Grundsatzfragen - Diskussion in der amerikanischen Ethnologie*; Berlin (= Forschung zur Ethnologie und Sozialpsychologie, Bd. 6).

Saitz, Robert L. + Cervenka, Edward, J. 1972: *Handbook of gestures*: Colombia and the United States; The Hague - Paris.

Sanders, Willy 1973: *Linguistische Stiltheorie. Probleme, Prinzipien und moderne Perspektiven des Sprachstils*; Göttingen (= kleine Vandenhoek-Relhe 1386).

Sapir, Edward 1961: *Die Sprache. Eine Einführung in das Wesen der Sprache* (1921); München.

de Saussure, Ferdinand 1931: *Grundfragen der allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft*; Berlin - Leipzig; [²1967].

Savory, Theodore ¹1957: *The art of translation*; London; [²1968; Nachdr. 1969].

Seidler, Herbert ²1963: *Allgemeine Stilistik*; 2. Aufl., Göttingen; [¹1953].

Shouby, E. 1951: *The influence of the Arabic language on the psychology of the Arabs*; in: The Middle East Journal, vol. 5, 284-302.

Spangenberg, Karl 1967: *Sprachsoziologie und Dialektforschung*; in: wiss. Zs. der Friedrich Schiller-Universität Jena, Gesellschafts- und sprachwiss. Reihe 16, 567-575.

Spiegel, Der 1981: *Nahost. Eure Glückseligkeit*; Nr. 14, 35. Jahrgang, 30. März, S. 202.

Sulaymān, Muḥammad Sulaymān o.J.: *al-ʿāmmiyya fī tiyāb al-fuṣḥā. balāġatuhā, ʾmṯāluhā, ḫasā'iṣuhā*; Kairo.

Šūšā, Fārūq 1970a: *luġatunā l-ǧamīla*; in: al-mulḥak al-'adabī von 'al-'anbar vom 19.7.1970.

Šūšā, Fārūq 1972: *luġatunā l-ǧamīla*; in: maǧallat al-ǧadīd 19, 31-40.

Sutschkow, Boris [1]1972: *Historische Schicksale des Realismus. Betrachtungen über eine Schaffensmethode*; Berlin - Weimar; [Original: 1970].

Schadewaldt, Wolfgang [3]1973: *Das Problem des Übersetzens* (1927); in: Störig, 223-241.

Schäfers, Bernhard [1]1976: *Sozialstruktur und Wandel der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Ein Studienbuch zu ihrer Soziologie und Sozialgeschichte*; 1. Aufl., Stuttgart.

Schelsky, Helmut [1]1965: *Auf der Suche nach Wirklichkeit. Gesammelte Aufsätze*; 1. Aufl., Düsseldorf - Köln.

Scherfer, Peter 1977: *Funktionale Sprachvarianten: Eine Untersuchung zum Französischen unter fremdsprachendidaktischem Aspekt*; Kronberg/Ts. (= Monographien. Linguistik u. Kommunikations wissenschaft, Bd. 31).

Schippan, Thea [2]1975: *Einführung in die Semasiologie*; 2., überarb. Aufl., Leipzig [[1]1972].

Schleiermarcher, Friedrich [3]1973: *Methoden des Übersetzens* (1813/1838); in: Störig, 38-70.

Schmidt, Siegfried J. 1971: *Ästhetizität. Philosophische Beiträge zu einer Theorie des Ästhetischen*; München (= Grundfragen der Literaturwissenscha t 2).

Schmidt, Siegfried J. 1972: *Text als Forschungsobjekt der Texttheorie*; in: DU 24.4, 7-28.

Schmidt, Wilhelm [6]1968: *Deutsche Sprachkunde. Ein Handbuch für Lehrer und Studierence mit einer Einführung in die Probleme des sprachkundlichen Unterrichts*; 6., durchges. Aufl., Berlin.

Schmidt-Hidding, Wolfgang 1962: *Englische Idiomatik in Stillehre und Literatur*; München (= Studien und Texte zur Englischen Philologie, Bd. 5).

Schmidt-Hidding, Wolfgang 1963: *Deutsche Sprichwörter und Redewendungen. Vom Gebrauch der bildhaften Redewendungen im Deutschen*; in: DUA 13.1-2, 13-26.

Schmitz, Carl August (Hg.) 1963: *Kultur*; Frankfurt/Main.

Schönfeld, Helmut 1976: *Methoden bei empirischen Untersuchungen zum Sprachverhalten hinsichtlich der sprachlichen Existenzformen*; in: Viereck, 219-247.

von Stackelbers, Jürgen 1978: *Weltliteratur in Deutscher Übersetzung. Vergleichende Analyse*; München.

Stockler-Edel, Anna 1976: *Gesprächsanalyse in einer bestimmten Interview-Situation*; in: Viereck, 249-276.

Störig, Hans Joachim (Hg.) ³1973: *Das Problem des Übersetzens*; 3. Aufl., Darmstadt (= Wege der Forschung, Bd. VIII): [²1969].

Ṭabāna, Bādawī ²1967: ᶜilm al-bayān. dirāsa tārīḫiyya fanniyya fī 'uṣūl al-balāġa al-ᶜarabiyya; 2. Aufl., Kairo.

Taraman, Soheir 1979: *Probleme der Übersetzung stilistisch gefärbter Wörter und Wendungen aus dem Deutschen ins Arabische, untersucht an Dramen Bertolt Brechts* - M.A.-Arbeit (Masch.); Kairo (unveröffentlicht).

Taymūr,'Aḥmad ³O.J.: *al-kināyāt al-ᶜāmmiyya*; 3. Aufl., Beirut.

Taymūr,'Aḥmad ³1970: *al-'amṯāl al-ᶜāmmiyya*; 3. Aufl., Kairo.

Taymūr,'Aḥmad 1971: *muᶜgam taymūr al-kabīr fil-'alfāẓ al-ᶜāmmiyya*, Bd. 1; Kairo.

Thun, Harald 1976: *Probleme der Phraseologie. Untersuchungen zur wiederholten Rede mit Beispielen aus dem Französischen, Italienischen, Spanischen und Rumänischen*; Diss., Tübingen (= Beiheft zur Zs. für Romanische Philologie 168).

Tylor, Edward B. 1963: *Die Culturwissenschaft* (Leipzig 1873); in: Schmitz, 33-53.

Vermeer, Hans J. ¹1972: *Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft. Eine Einfuhrung*; 1. Aufl., Freiburg i.Br. (= rombach hochschul paperback band 48).

Vermeer, Hans J. 1974a: *Interaktions-Determinanten. Ein Versuch zwischen Pragma- und Soziolinguistik* (1972); in: Gerhard Nickel+Albert Raasch (Hgg.): Kongreßericht der 5. Jahrestasung der GAL, Heidelberg, 297-321; (IRAL-Sonderband).

Vermeer Hans J. 1974b: *Zur Beschreibung des Übersetzunssvorgangs* (1972); in: Wolfram Wilss+Gisela Thome (Hgg.): Aspekte der theoretischen, sprachenpaarbezogenen und angewandten Sprachwissenschaft; Saarbrücken, 1c-34.

Vermeer, Hans J. 1978a: *Ein Rahmen für eine allgemeine Translationstheorie*; in: Lebende Sprachen 23, 99-102.

Vermeer, Hans J. 1978b: *Sprache und Kulturanthropologie. Ein Plädoyer für interdisziplinäre Zusammenarbeit in der Fremdsprachendidaktik*; in: DaF 4, 1-21.

Vermeer, Hans J. 1979: *Vom 'richtigen' Übersetzen*; in: Mitteilungsblatt für Dolmetscher und Übersetzer 25.4, 2-8.

Vermeer Hans J. 1981: *Übersetzen und Verständnis. Bemerkungen zu Werner Koller, Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft* (1979); in: Mitteilungsblatt für Dolmetscher und Übersetzer 27.3, 5-15.

Viereck, Wolfgang (Hg.) 1976: *Sprachliches Handeln - Soziales Verhalten. Ein Reader zur Pragmalinguistik und Soziolinguistik*, München.

Vossler, Karl [3]1973: *Sprachgemeinschaft als Gesinnungsgemeinschaft* (1925); in: Störig, 170-193.

Wāfī, ᶜAlī ᶜAbd al-Wāḥid ⁷o.J.: *fiqh al-luġa*; 7. Aufl., Kairo [?].

Wahrig, Gerhard (Hg.) 1966 ff. + 1970: *Das große deutsche Wörterbuch*; Gütersloh; (Sonderausgabe 1970).

Walther, Wiebke 1978a: *Nachworte*; in: Machfus 1978, 197-221.

Walther, Wiebke 1978b: *Anmerkungen*; in: Machfus 1978, 226-228.

Wehr, Hans 1934: *Die Besonderheiten des heutigen Hocharabischen. Mit Berücksichtigung der Einwirkung der europäischen Sprachen*; in: MSOS XXXVII, 1-64.

Wellek, Rene 1969: *Der Realismusbegriff in der Literaturwissenschaft*; in: Brinkmann, 1-20.

White, Leslie A. 1963: *Der Begriff Kultur* (1959); in: Schmitz, 358-388.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee 1941: *The relation of habitual thought and behavior to language*; in: Culture, Language and Personality. Essays in memory of Edward Sapir; ed. by Leslie Sapir, Menasha, Wisc., 75-93.

Wielandt, Rotraud 1980: *Das Bild der Europäer in der modernen arabischen Erzähl- und Theaterliteratur*; Beirut (= Beiruter Texte und Studien, hrsg. v. Orient-Institut der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Bd. 23).

Wikan, Unni 1980: *Life among the poor in Cairo*; New York; (aus dem Englischen von Ann Henning); [Oslo ¹1976].

Wilber, Donald N. 1969: *United Arab Republic Egypt. Its people, its society, its culture*; New Haven, Conneticut.

Wilss, Wolfram [1]1977: *Übersetzungswissenschaft. Probleme und Methoden*; 1. Aufl., Stuttgart; [ins Engl. Übers. v. W. Wilss (als überarb. u. erw. Fassung der dt. Originalausg.): The science of translation, problems and methods; Stuttgart 1982 (= Tübinger Beiträge zur Lincuistik, 180)].

Wörterbuch der deutschen Gegenwartssprache [WDG] [1]1965 fr.: (in 6 Bde.); hrsg. v. Ruth Klappenbach + Wolgang Steinitz; Berlin.

Wunderlich, Dieter (Hg.) 1972c: *Linguistische Pragmatik*; Frankfurt/Main (= Schwerpunkte, Linguistik u. Kommunikationswissenschaft, Bd. 12).

Wunderlich, Dieter 1972d *Sprechakte*; in: Dieter Wunderlich + Utz Maas (Hgg.): Pragmatik und sprachliches Handeln Teil B; Frankfurt/Main, 71-188.

Wunderlich Dieter [1]1976: *Studien zur Sprechakttheorie*; 1. Aufl., Frankfurt/Main.